Doktori (PhD) értekezés

Németh Anikó

Pécs, 2002

The Meanings of *Work* and *Labour* in William Morris' and John Ruskin's Aesthetics and Educative Ethics

BY
Anikó NÉMETH (MA, MEd)

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Literature

Pécsi Tudományegyetem
Bölcsészettudományi Kar
Irodalomtudományi Doktori Iskola

Pécs, 2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank my mother to encourage me to choose the topic of English art and beauty. By reflecting and writing I have had the opportunity to use my knowledge and thoughts I have gained within both literature and applied linguistics. The long hours of talking through my questions with her have made me become aware that besides beauty the notions of humanism and the power of how we work should also belong to the realm of aesthetics. I would also like to thank my two István-s to support me and let me work and 'function' as a researcher and writer.

My deepest appreciation goes to my colleagues, Dr. Sarolta Marinovich, Dr. György Endre Szőnyi and Dr. Attila Kiss, and friends who have contributed to my thinking process, and who never refused to meet me whenever I needed either a professional or a personal talk.

TARTALMI KIVONAT

A disszertációm témájául a tizenkilencedik század angol esztétika egy izgalmas korszakát választottam, amit a művészettörténészek prerafaelizmusnak neveznek. Ezen belül is csak két művész munkájával, William Morriséval és John Ruskinéval foglalkozom, a mozgalom két kiemelkedő és meghatározó gondolkodójáéval. Bár két ellentétes alkatú művészről van szó mégis, ahogyan esztétikájukban értékelik és elemzik a *munka (work és labour)* szó fogalmát, és ahogyan szépségeszméjükön keresztül a *munka* jelentésváltozatait összekapcsolják erkölcsi, etikai és oktatási kérdésekkel az sokban hasonló és megegyező.

A *munka* szó jelentésváltozásait az esztétika területén belül vizsgálom az adott társadalmi és kulturális körülményeket is figyelembe véve, ami tulajdonképpen követi a morrisi és a ruskini elméletet, mi szerint az esztétikán alapuló értékrend meghatározza - sőt meg is változtathatja a munka társadalmi, kulturális etikai és erkölcsi megítélését - ezért e kérdéseket mindezen fogalmak egymáshoz viszonyított kapcsolataiban elemzem. Továbbgondolva ezeket az összefüggéseket kikerülhetetlen, hogy az elemzés ne érintse és foglalkozzon a *hegemónia* és a *hatalom* problémájával, valamint a munka ezekhez való viszonyával. Hiszen bármilyen munkát is végez az ember - személyes érdekein és szépérzékén túl - az tükrözi az adott kultúra és hegemónia követelményeit és értékrendjét, ezen belül pedig egyes társadalmi rétegek, osztályok hatalmi viszonyát és érdekrendszerét. A disszertációm fő célja, hogy elemezze

- milyen mértékben és pontosan milyen kérdésekben is különbözik a *szépség* és *művészet* elméletein alapuló felfogás, ami a munka fogalmát illeti, szemben az adott kor tanaival és gyakorlatával (a munkához fűződő elvárásokéval), és
- vajon ennek a megközelítésnek és elméletnek a gyakorlattal (oktatással) való kapcsolata mennyiben szolgálja, vagy szolgálhatja-e egyáltalán, az elnyomottak, a szépségtől és a művészetektől megfosztottak érdekeit és vágyait.

Morris és Ruskin elmélete szerint a munka, akár hasznos, vagy akár szép és művészi darabbá formálódik is a gondolkodás legközvetlenebb eszköze. Kifejezi, kézzelfoghatóvá és láthatóvá teszi a természet közvetítésével az isteni szépséget, ami egyben az emberi jóság és boldogság forrása. Esztétikájukban a munka a kreatív és gondolkodó alkotásnak az eszköze, és ez az alkotás egyben Isten üzenete. Vagyis a

munka képessé teszi az embert, hogy a tehetségével, a fizikai erejével és a gondolatai hatalmával megpróbálja lemásolni a tökéletest: a természet. Ezen a szinten a munka és a természet már etikai és erkölcsi kérdéseket, sőt kötelezettségeket vet fel. Vagyis a munkán keresztül a szépség - a természet (isteni adomány) közvetítésével - eszköze a tanulásnak, az emberi és gondolati fejlődésnek, a fantáziának és a tudásnak. Ezen összefüggések Morris és Ruskin esztétikájában úgy szintetizálódnak, hogy az ember a földi lét sanyarúságát, lelki és testi csapásait, az örök bizonytalanságot csakis egyféleképpen tudja könnyebbé, elviselhetővé és néha széppé tenni, ami neki és másoknak is örömet okozhat. Ez pedig nem más, mint az esztétikai értékekből táplálkozó munka. Ennek feltétele pedig csakis az lehet, hogy minden ember önmagához képest a lehető legjobban dolgozzék. A munkája legyen méltó a tehetségéhez és a fizikai erejéhez. Ez a *munka* nevel, tanít és szépet hoz létre, szemben az adott társadalom hegemóniáját kiszolgáló munkával, ami kihasznál és megnyomorít. A szépség és öröm pedig minden elkészült munkában jelen van, legyen az egy szép gomb egy női ruhán, vagy akár egy katedrális. Csakis az ilyen értékrendben gyökerező munka fogja megbecsülni, sőt felkutatni az új Turnereket. A *munka* a pénzen túl szellemi és erkölcsi érték lesz. Ezért ezt az esztétikát olyan „hatalomnak" tekintem, ami esztétikai, etikai és edukatív értékrendjével a *munka* szó új értelmezését jelenti. Ez az értelmezés pedig nem azonos a viktoriánus kor vezető rétegeinek érdekeit szolgáló munka fogalmával.

Az elemzéshez elsősorban Tony BennettAnthony Easthope, Terry Eagleton, ,Michel Foucault, Stuart Hall, és Raymond Williams - teóriáit használom fel és adaptálom.

ABSTRACT

My thesis undertakes the tasks of analysing William Morris' and John Ruskin's – the Pre-Raphaelite thinkers' and artists' - aesthetics in relation to *work and labour*. Their attitudes towards *art and beauty* are different in many points, and especially Ruskin's theories are sometimes contradictory, but my main interest is on questions that show how they relate *ethics, education and morals* to each other within the realm of *aesthetics*.

I examine what meanings *work and labour* may convey by viewing these notions through aesthetics. Thus trying to enhance our understanding of Morris' and Ruskin's way of viewing man in his different roles: the worker, the thinker and the creator:. *Work and labour* rooted in aesthetics bring about new cultural, social ethical and educative aspects of these notions, therefore in the analysis I cannot avoid involving the questions of *hegemony, civilisation and culture* and their relationship with aesthetics. The main aim of my work is to look at how much the meanings of *work and labour* based on the theories of *art and beauty* differ from the Victorian tenets and practices (principles and conditions of work). From this it follows that the aesthetics of Morris and Ruskin represent power. The primary qualities of this power are happiness, creation, goodness and social, and artistic sensitiveness. By Morris and Ruskin *work and labour,* either useful or beautiful, are the direct means of expressing thoughts, intelligence and talent. They consider nature as god's work that can teach man how to produce beauty and work of high quality. In contrast to god's perfection represented by the materials, shapes, forms and colours of nature man's work often ruins and exploits both nature's and other peoples' work. At this level the notions of work and nature raise ethical and moral questions. These relationships are synthetised in an aesthetics whose focus is man and his creative work. By nature (god's gift) man is not left alone, he can learn from her, use her materials until he is able to protect her and perceive, and teach her laws. These laws should be kept regardless of what classes people belong to. Work based on these principles will be able to appreciate and discover new Turnesrs and fight against mechanical and machinery work..

To support my arguments and views I use and adapt the theories of British Studies. My analysis is built on mainly Tony Bennett, Anthony Tony Bennett, Anthony Easthope, Terry Eagleton, ,Michel Foucault, Stuart Hall, and Raymond Williams

Table of Contents

"Whatsoever strength the man had in him lies written in the work " [1]

Chapter 1 Introduction

Views of aesthetics are often used in English literature in the nineteenth century to explain moral, political and social questions. It is not a unique phenomenon for artistic and political considerations to be interwoven with each other so that man could find answers and solutions to the fearful challenges of changes brought about by the Industrial Revolution[2]. Escapism and condemnation of the ever increasing power of money are as much the features of art as nostalgia about intact nature, harmony and creativity. The chance for man to be able to experience the birth of perfection and beauty by *work and labour*[3] became a common aspiration.

In this study I want to look at one specific aspect of this period. My main interest is to explore and examine the set of meanings of *work and labour* in **William Morris'** and **John Ruskin's** *aesthetics* in relation to *ethics, morals and education.* I am aware that Morris' and Ruskin's ideas and concepts in many points and questions are often different and sometimes contradictory, even their personalities are very different. Nevertheless, I will attempt to examine and answer the questions raised in this study by looking at both artists' theories and ways they try to implement their concepts into practice[4]. More specifically what may relate these two artists' and thinkers' aesthetics,

---

[1] Thomas Carlyle, *Past and Present* .Richard D. Altick ed., (New York: University Press, 1843), 160.

[2] I refer here to the views and definitions of Clark, J.C.D. *English Society 1688-1832.*(Cambridge: CUP, 1985) and Derek Fraser *The Evolution of the British Welfare* State (London: MacMillan, 1873). in relation to the notion of Industrial Revolution.

[3] I will not separate the meanings of these two notions in this study because the framework of my arguments will be William Morris' and John Ruskin's aesthetics with the question of work and labour in focus. Chapter 6 will show clearly that these two notions convey similar meanings and are often interchangeable. I deliberately will not involve the notion of toil into this analyses as , shown later, it is meanly used as hard, intolerable, inhuman physical labour.

[4] The notion of practice here mainly means education. For teaching purposes they not only write essays, books, articles and pamphlets but meet people, lecture on how they should work and think to be able to better their own life and cope with social and cultural changes. Both Morris and Ruskin

in my view, are their humanism, social and artistic sensibility, their theories of how to prepare generations for protecting nature and the values of past time, and for making and creating. In the followings it will be important to highlight their main works which the analyses of this study is based on as well as a few social, cultural and family facts and data that must have affected their mentality, intelligence and knowledge. I will do this so that we may find understanding of points in their aesthetics which both on theoretical and educative levels are similar and the process which, m my opinion, has advanced towards a system that I will call 'empowered aesthtetics'[5].

William Morris (1834-1896) who, says Philip Henderson, "never reconciles himself to modern civilisation., careless of metaphysics and religion, as well as of scientific analysis, but with a deep love of the earth and the life on it, and a passion for the history of the past of mankind"[6]. In Routh's view, he was "a born artist, craftsman and idealist and became an ardent anglo-catholic"[7]. Morris came from a privileged middle-class family. His father had a successful firm of discount brokers. He learned of the Pre-Raphaelite's work while at Oxford through the Germ[8], the Pre-Raphaelite journal, and Ruskin's Edinburgh Lectures and Pre-Raphaelitism. Morris and Burne-Jones became good friends in Oxford in 1853. Both were deeply affected by the cult of medievalism and agreed that the model of the religious Middle Ages in terms of organising a society would be the best to 'copy' in order to better the present one. Just like Ruskin he also believed that the new area would produce values only through the intense study of the middle ages. Morris had a successful career as a designer, but his career as a painter was brief. They were under the influence of Tennyson's *Morte d'Arthur*. Later in London he shared their studio at Red Lion Square with Rossetti. In 1859 Morris married Jane Burden, the model of his 'Queen Guenevere'. Philip Webb designed (1831-1913) Red House for the couple. Burne-Jones planned tempera paintings and designed some

---

clearly verbalise what they mean by education and how it should be functioning, which I will show in chapter 8, in the English society.

[5] Details are in chapter 5.3.

[6] Philip Henderson ed Foreword *The Letters Of William Morris To His Family And Friends.* (London: Longmans, 1950), xxi.

[7] H.V. Routh *Money, Morals And Manners As Revealed In Modern Literature.* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1935).

[8] The Germ "Thoughts towards nature in Poetry, Literature, and Art" only four parts were published; the first in January, 1850, the last in April, in the same year. According to the announcement

stained-glasses for them. Thompson remarks that while Morris was writing *The Earthly Paradise* (1868-1870) he became convinced of the importance of architecture as, he thought, poetry "was no more than a skirmish on the edge of the main battlefield"[9]. He tried out his talent by writing poems e, g, *The Defence of Guenevere,* holding lectures on art for the protection of ancient builsings. With the publication of *The Earthly Paradiise* (1867-70), a collection of ancient and medieval tales, and *The Life and Death of Jason* (1867), a romantic narrative, he established his reputation also as a poet. His lectures: *Hopes and Fears for Art, Signs of Change and Architecture, Industry and Wealth* between 1877 and 1882, express his theory of art and life embedded in aesthetics. Morris established his Firm in 1851 the "Morris, Marshall, Faulkner and Company, Fine Art Workmen". They issued a prospectus, any 'species of decoration', made furniture, metalwork and embroidery. Morris and the company, as Adams sees it, "were attracted to the culture of the Middle Ages, but used an essentially Ruskinean understanding of medieval art not as some romantic refuge but as an antidote and alternative to the shortcoming of present-day industrial society"[10]. The moral and aesthetic principles of the Firm were, along with the growth of mass-production which debased the applied arts and ruined craftsmen, that artists should support handicrafts and get people to appreciate the 'imperfect', but beautiful pieces of work bearing the mind and soul of the worker in contrast to the perfectly finished machine-work. Morris designed wallpapers out of which the patterns of 'Bird', 'Bird and Vine' an 'Dove and Rose' and 'Peacock and Dragon' have become famous and well-known. The Firm also expanded into carpet making. In his factory he worked as a his own men. After the foundation of the Society for the Protection of Ancient buildings in 1877 Morris started public lectures on art and architecture. He wanted radical social changes and far-reaching reforms and soon got in touch with the radical leaders of the working class in London. By joining the Social Democratic Federation he committed himself to socialism[11]. He contributed money and articles to its magazine 'Justice'. In 1890 he

---

"This Periodical will consist original Poems, Stories to develop thought and principle, Essays concerning Art and other objects, and Analytic; Review of current Literature-particularly of Poetry"

[9] E.P. Thompson *William Morris. Romantic to Revolutionary.* (London: Merlin Press, 1955,) 27

[10] Steven Adams *The Art of The Pre-Raphaelites* (London :New Burlington Books, 1988,) 67.

[11] This topic and the question of to what extent Morris's socialism differed from that of the Marxists' are touched upon in chapter 6, Subtitle :Happiness in Work and by Work..
Morris read Marx' "Das Kapital" in French and although Marx lived in London since 1849 Morris never met him. .In E.P. Thompson's opinion (1955, :667) Morris' creative writing after he joined the Socialist movement has three phases:

founded the Hammersmith Socialist Society attracting John Burns, Bernard Shaw and Sydney Webb. Together with the musician and philosopher, Belfort Bax, they wrote *Socialism its Growth and Outcome*, published in 1893. Two of his major late works *The Dream of John Ball* (1888) a prose romance, and *News from Nowhere* (1890) are worth mentioning. I will also use the ideas of the latter piece of work to support my arguments throughout this study. In his declining years he devoted his talent and time to publishing and established the Kelmscott Press in 1891.

John Ruskin's powerful personality helped the Pre-Raphaelites[12] to articulate their, sometimes vague and inconsistent, aims. Ruskin,[13] the artist, the art and literary

---

1st :.the occasional propagandists poems published as Chants for Socialists written for Justice or Commonweal between 1883-1886

2nd "The Dream of John Bull" (1886) and "News from Nowhere" (1890)

3rd. The late prose romances e.g. "The Sundering Flood"

[12] Seven young men founded the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood movement in 1848 adopting its name in deference to painters working before the time of Raphael, who together with his successors produced some of the most beautiful work of the High Renaissance. The members of the movement were Dante Gabriel Rosetti, William Holman Hunt, John Everett Millais, James Collison, PG Stephens; a sculptor, Thomas Woolner and William Michel Rossetti; diarist and secretary of the movement. By the word Pre-Raphaelite they meant the arts before Raphael, whose art was considered to have distorted the truths of religious doctrines so explicitly represented by the Gospels. This over-refined tradition was still in their naturalism. His practice in the nineteenth-century. They wanted to shrug the burden of the Renaissance as well as to capture the world and reality, mainly nature, not according to the rules of the Academy but as they saw it. They emphasised that their way of seeing things was directed by God's work[12] and its perfection. They rebelled against the classical doctrines of the Academic tradition; the Grand Style. The Royal Academy of Arts was founded in 1768 with its first president Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-92). The aim of the Academy was to raise the profile of British painters and, in Steven Adams[12] opinion,. "to provide a repository for the great examples of painting and sculpture in order that the native genius of British painters might be 'tamed' by the example of great art". The Academy represented a style and a method of painting originally invented in 16th-century Italy. Morris wrote that unlike the true artist

> who is determined at all events to turn out something which shall be beautiful and pleasant [now] the individualism reigns supreme among our painters; that is to say, that while some plagiarise in the coolest way from the works of those that happen to be most in fashion; others and these are the cleverest, disregard their own real talents and pretend to an originality which they have not (1994, 37)

The dominant figures of the movement were Millais, Rossetti and Hunt. The first paintings of the Pre-Raphaelites used themes from medieval literature or the Bible eg. D.G. Rossetti's "The Girlhood of Mary Virgin" (1849-1850), Morris' "Queen Guinevere" (1858). Rossetti's mysticism and symbolism inspired by chivalric themes and medieval poetry as well as William Blake's art are reflected in his paintings e.g.: "The first Anniversary of the death of Beatrice" (1853-54).The Pre-Raphaelites insisted that the painters of the 14th and 15th centuries were "unsophisticated craftsmen" and claimed that painting should return to Nature, to the unaffected approach of the artists in the Middle Ages. Among their values, as John Rees[12] sees it, are:

> fresh vision,
> challenge to orthodoxies,
> resistance to the industrial world,
> a new 'truth' which is fidelity to Nature

The revival of the Middle Ages also pushes the philosophy of Architecture toward revaluating the principles of Gothic (its philosophy is initiated by Pugin's work and Morris' home the Red House that reflects the features of the fifteenth century design). Since the beginning of 1830s the High Church, a militant sect within the Church of England, making an attempt to revive the traditions and the rituals of the early Church attacked the Pre-Raphaelites and they became the centre of critical attention. They were criticised mainly for their superfluous details and poor perspective. It was John Ruskin who came

critic and the 'practical moralist' (Routh 1937, 75) was born in 1819, the only child of middle-class Scottish sherry merchant and his Evangelical wife. He was educated in Oxford. In Routh's (1935, 67-68) view the Calvinistic and commercially focused home deeply affected his genius primarily through the Bible narrative: the Psalms and Prophets and his travels to France and Italy. It is noteworthy that his 'socialism, was rooted not in the age of reason but in the radical ethics of the Gospels"[14]. Landow points out that "his Evangelicalism affected his aesthetics as later humanism influenced his political economics"[15]. His first work outlining his ideas regarding nature was the first volume of *Modern Painters*[16]. The subsequent editions of *Modern Painters* which, in Routh's (1937, 160) opinion, should have been called *Modern Culture* served to clarify the aims, values and principles of the movement. These principles are laid out clearly which are:

landscape is a language,

the perfection of nature should be represented in each work,

and imagination or intellect should be developed by involving everyone in creation by making workers aware of the responsibility for his/her work. .

It is worth quoting Ruskin's own words about his other two important books, entitled *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849) and *The Stones of Venice* (1853)[17]. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* was to show that "certain right states of temper and moral feeling were the margin powers by which all good architecture, without exception, had been produced" and

> The Stones of Venice had, from beginning to end, no other aim than to show that the Gothic architecture of Venice had arisen out of, and indicated in all its

---

to defend the movement, especially series of letters were published in the Time, the first of which appeared in May 1851.
I have also consulted Rachel Barnes *The Pre-Raphaelites and their world.* (London: The Tate Gallery Publishin,) 1998.as well as Bell Quentin *Victorian Artists* (London: Routlege and Kegan Paul),1967.

[13] To get further details of his art and personality it is worth reading Harold Bloom *The Literary Criticism of John Ruskin.* (New York: Anchor Books), 1965.

[14] John Rosenberg *The Darkening Glass. A Portrait of Ruskin's Genius.* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963,) 32.

[15] George P. Landow, *The Aesthetic And Critical Theories Of John Ruskin* chap. 2. (New Yersey: Princeton University Press, 1971), 90.

[16] The chronological list of Modern Painters is: volume 1. 1843, volume ii 1846, volumes iii and iv. 1856, volume v. 1860.

[17] Both works are the main source of my analysis regarding *work and labour*

features, a state of pure national faith, and of domestic virtue; and that its Renaissance architecture had arisen out of, and in all its features indicated, a state of national infidelity, and of domestic corruption" [18].

It was also *The Stones of Venice* which had a great impact on William Morris. Ball considers as one of Ruskin's main weaknesses that his "enthusiasm and earnestness often led him to assert what he thought and felt at the moment, chance preferences and dislikes, irrespective of what had gone before"[19]. It is worth mentioning that besides painting and architecture he was also interested in music. He writes about Beethowen's *Adelaide* and Mozart's *Requiem* in *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849, 125).In his work *The Political Economy of Art Subsequently called 'A Joy for Ever'* (1907) he advocates his theories of economy rooted in his aesthetics. This work will serve as one of the chief sources of my analyses. Two of his books, entitled *Munera Pulveris* (1863) and *Unto This Last* (1860), which appeared in the Cornhill Magazine, attack the orthodox political economy. His later social works, *Time and Tide* (1867) and *The Crown of Wild Olive* (1898) are full of fantastic, utopian and dreamlike elements just like Morris' work, *News From Nowhere*. In Ashley Thorndike's opinion

> his utopia aimed first at the abolition of poverty and second at the promotion of welfare, physical and moral. Unlike the socialists he believed in a maintenance of the class system much after the fashion of feudalism, and in general his ideal for labour and labourers called for a revision from modern to medieval condition[20].

Regarding Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics I will emphasise that it is, both in content and aims, different from the Victorian "hegemonic"[21] aesthetics. And I will argue that approaching the notion of *work and labour* through *art and beauty* may result in a theory as well as in practice (education) that can effectively represent the desires and

---

[18] John Ruskin, *The Crown* Of Wild Olive. Four Lectures On Industry And War (London: George Allen, 1898,) 88 .

[19] A.H.R. Ball ed. *Ruskin as Literary Critic* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1928,) 10.

[20] Ashley Thorrdike *Literature In A Changing Age* (New York: Books For Library Press, 1920), 114.

[21] By the concept of hegemony here I mean Morag Shiach's definition which says, "the dominant culture provides the norm in relation to which all other cultural production evaluates or describes itself" Morag Shiach, *Discourse On Popular Culture* (California: Stanford University Press, 1989), 17.

needs of subdued classes[22] as well as practices (attitudes, methods towards teaching) primarily designed for making work bearable and the source of *beauty and creation.* Out of many exciting questions offered in their philosophy I will deal with and examine the notions of **work and labour**[23] I will argue that by a thorough analyses of these notions within the realm of their aesthetics, whose centre is man: the frail, the creative, the thinker and the emotional human being, will help us understand the complexity of how they view *art and beauty* as a potential means of solving social and economic problems

Therefore, throughout this study I will

- show that aesthetics by developing "aesthetic conscious"[24] is one way of attempting to change people's attitude toward *work and labour* and environment, and
- analyse these artists' views setting off a process in which art and beauty are the means of affecting Victorian hegemonic endeavours by equipping the "slaves of the society"[25] with a sense of beauty which may enable them to understand the power of their work and labour.

For the analysis I will use William Morris' and John Ruskin's sage writings[26] that focus on *art and beauty, work and labour, architecture* and the effects of *changes* in the nineteenth century. I will mention the phenomenon of Pre-Raphaelitism[27] only in relation to questions and problems raised within Morris' and Ruskin's philosophy in relation to *work and labour* In my attempt to analyse Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetic

---

[22] Clarke John, et al..: eds. "Sub Cultures, Culture and Class," in Bennett et al. eds., *Culture, Ideology and Social Process. A Reader* (London: The Open University Press,) 1981.

[23] I will not separate these notions from each other as their meanings are often intercchangeable in Morris' and Ruskin's philosophy. I will indicate when there is a difference in meaning between them, and I will consciously not involve the notion of toil in the analyses because, in my opinion, it chiefly conveys the meaning of hard, humiliating labour. Chapter 6 will provide a detailed examination of how I see these notions in Morris' and Ruskin's theories of art and beauty.

[24] Geoffrey Scott, *The Architecture of Humanism. A Study in the History of Taste* (Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1914), 102.

[25] William Morris, *Signs Of Change. Lectures On Socialism.* vol. 23 (London: Longman Green, 1970), 95.

[26] By their sage writings I chiefly mean their works on these questions: art, people, man, architecture, beauty, aesthetics, work and labour, I would emphasise Morris's writings and lectures, for example , *Art and People , Art and Socialism (1884), The Decorative Arts, How We live and How We Might Live? (1884), The Lesser of Art of Life (1882)* which are so characteristic of their way of thinking.

theories and practices[28] I have applied theories drawn from Cultural Studies as developed in Britain. In Chapter II I will establish the theoretical basis of my study. I consider my line of thought based on concepts drawn from Cultural Studies as a framework for trying to understand, first of all, man's work and labour in England in the nineteenth century, its impact on environment and on man's emotional and professional development. Then I will examine whether aesthetics can really affect the content and values of work and labour so powerfully that it will change people's mentality, values[29] and attitudes. I have handled these modern theories in a critical manner and tried to observe discrepancies that may occur when analysing one aspect of English culture within the disciplines of Cultural Studies. In this respect I will approach the meaning of utopia cautiously as, in my view, Morris' and Ruskin's philosophy can easily be stigmatised as utopian. The reason for not using this word to define the main quality of their aesthetics is the main thesis of this study, that is, the aesthetics of a group of people[30] can initiate a process which in its specificity[31] starts as a protest against the hegemony and power of the Victorian "dominant cultures"[32] and gets 'charged' with power itself while embracing the realms of ethics, morals and

---

[27] To show the essence of this I will use Ruskin's views also in his work entitled, *Pre-Raphaelitism* 1851.

[28] In my view, practice happens at two main levels in the context of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics. Firstly, they intensively participate in creating beauty themselves, for example, they paint, design, and publish books.
Secondly, they teach their principles and theories as well as working out techniques and approaches of how their doctrines could be applied in practice.

[29] Here I would emphasise aesthetic values mainly because they are one of the central questions of this study. An exciting discussions of what criteria of aesthetical value are employed by different social groups and whether these values contribute to the social, cultural, economic and educative success of these groups is found in: John Frow, *Cultural Studies and Cultural Value* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995). He tries, in theoretical terms, to relate a Foucaultian concept of knowledge in modernity with a (post)-Marxist account of class formations and structures based on possessing cultural capital. The questions he raises, for example, "What do we teach? High culture, low culture, or some mix of the two? Is it possible to give a fully descriptive account of value (historical and sociological)- where would that lead us, and where would our own cultural position be found in relation to this description? And who are 'we', who agonise over such questions?" (1995, 15) are also the basis of my line of thought in chapter 8.

[30] The word people denotes the Pre-Raphaelites but as has been mentioned before only Morris' and Ruskin's philosophy will be in the focus of my analyses out of the views of the several members of the movement.

[31] By this word I want to emphasise what Henry Ladd's point in *The Victorian Morality of Art An Analysis of Ruskin Esthetic* (New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, 1932) namely that the Pre-Raphaelites "argued from aesthetics back to morals" (168).

education with the assistance of art and beauty. And, this power is the one that is expressed and realised by work and labour. These theories have also helped me uncover and detect the points, tones and nuances of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics which has one crucial endeavour, that is, to rethink the meanings of *work and labour* within *aesthetics*. By discussing the notions of *civilisation and cultures* in Chapter III before looking at aesthetics, hegemony and power while making labour and work the focus of the enquiry I do not want to emphasise the importance of any order, but to aid in both visualising and understanding the human, social and cultural implications of the process, which I will term empowered aesthetics[33], both in time and space. Neither of the notions behind which processes are running are either subordinated to, or superimposed over, or parallel with the others. Each entails the other and none of them can exist without the other. In this chapter. I will pose the questions of *culture, cultures, class, classes and working class* within theories drawn from **Cultural Studies**. To do so I will use Raymond Williams'[34] definitions to clarify the meanings of culture [35] and applied Gramsci's[36] views looking at culture from the perspective of the discipline of man's inner self in an organisation in which man tries to understand values, rights and obligations. Frow's theory of "culture of work" (1995, 115) has made it possible to understand the specific relationship between culture, work[37], hegemony and aesthetics.

---

[32] I have applied the ideas and definitions of John Clarke et al.. "Sub Cultures, Cultures and Class," in Tony Bennett et al. eds. , *Cultures, Ideology and Social Process* (London: The Open University Press, 1981), 55.

[33] What I mean by the notion of 'empowered aesthetics' is introduced in section 5.3 and discussed at greater length in chapter 6.

[34] Raymond Williams, "The Analysis of Culture" in Tony Bennett et al. eds., *Culture, Ideology and Social Process. A Reader* (London: The Open University Press, 1981), 43-52.

[35] I am aware that there is a set of debates and controversy regarding the concept of culture within Cultural Studies. One view advocated by John Frow is that so far "cultural studies has failed seriously to engage with its relation to the tradition of theoretical and methodological reflection in cultural anthropology and ethnography" (1995, 7-9). Following Frow's suggestion I will also include Williams' view from his book *The Long Revolution* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964. Rev. edn. 1966), that culture is "the organisation of production, the structure of the family, the structure of institutions which express or govern social relationships, the characteristic forms through which members of the society communicate (42).

[36] Antonio Gramsci, "Selections from the Political Writings 1910-30". In Tony Bennett et al.. eds. , *Culture, Ideology and Social Process* (London: The Open University Press, 1981), 194.

[37] Frow thinks work in cultural studies carries the interest that is attributed to the "knowledge class: a commitment to the institutions of cultural capital, and simultaneously a set of anxieties about its place within these institutions" (1995, 130). By analysing the role and organisation of "cultural capital"

In order to arrive at the sense in which Morris' and Ruskin's views of culture regarding work and labour are different from those of the dominant classes I want to approach the topic by showing the 'fears' and 'hopes' of Victorian people. My reason for doing so is the same when highlighting the notions of class and classes and from these the meanings of working classes. That is, I consider their humanism, which I will touch upon in section 5.2 as the root of their aesthetics which is behind such endeavours as trying to solve the serious social, cultural and economic problems of working classes. To establish the meaning of working class I have applied Pierre Bourdieu's[38] theory. And, to be able to understand the specific qualities of the British working class I have used Richard Hoggart's[39] concepts. The value of Poulantzas'[40] views of labour in the processes of political and cultural struggles was to see clearly the direct relationship between "the monopolisation of knowledge" and the "permanent exclusion on the subordinated side of those who are deemed not to know how" (237). He categorises labour on the basis of mental and physical activities, saying that in a society what is considered mental and manual labour mainly depends on a schooling system working through "a series of rituals, secrets and symbolisms which are to a considerable extent those of "general culture", and whose main purpose is to distinguish manual labour [from mental labour]" (268). Although the focus of my study is not on how to analyse the quality of knowledge behind mental and physical work and how it is valued by education in the nineteenth century, this concept has helped me to come to an understanding of what meanings of "mind and hands" are brought about by aesthetics and what power they may represent within its realm.

---

he concludes that the new middle class which he terms "knowledge class or workers" (120) forms the basis for "the struggle over the organisation of work and for the individual self-respect [...]. It underlines the differentiation of working classes from working class forms of work: one based in 'knowledge' and structured around loyalty, 'social exchange', and responsibility, the other based in 'skill' (125

[38] Pierre Bourdieu, "What Makes A Social Class? On The Theoretical and Practical Existence Of Groups," *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* (1987), 1-17.
A basic discussion of the term is found also in Frow's work which articulates his argument in five main points and offers a diagram to show the complex conditions of class formation within the sphere of the domain of struggle including also the formation of class interests (1995, 104-106).

[39] Richard Hoggart, *The Uses Of Literacy*. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1957).

[40] Nicos Poulantzas, *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism*, trans. David Frenbach (London: Verso, 1975).

In Chapter IV I place the question of aesthetics, art and beauty in the framework of Arthur Danto's[41] views and Alan Sinfield's concept of, for example, "idealistic aesthetics" [42] within which he analyses the components of aesthetic values filled with meanings and evoked by welfare societies. He considers art as the means of "insult" of the dominant culture as well as power over other "cultures". His points of view have led me later to select the qualities attached to work and labour by Morris' and Ruskin' aesthetics. They are very much aware of the fact that aesthetics is exposed to the power of dominance determining and specifying a particular set of criteria to be able to exert an influence on subordinate classes and to that of institutions within which it operates. The exciting point of their philosophy is not this awareness, but the approaches, both at theoretical and practical (education) levels, by which they want to show that art and beauty are not the sole 'property' of the dominant culture, and the "authority of the academic mind" (Frow 1995, 68). The art and beauty they talk about and create are not to be "preserved in museums and art galleries" (67) they are to serve and develop people's sense of beauty. They are present in streets, in homes, even in railway stations, they can be touched and enjoyed. They are as much the way of life, mainly through creation, of working classes and the means of educating handicraftsmen and artists as of the dominant classes. The main question for them is whether people can perceive the potential beauty of work (theirs, others and Nature's), and how to teach them to appreciate and produce beauty in their own degree and sphere. Fiske's[43] idea that our way of living in an industrialised society determines the aesthetic ideals of forms is similar to Morris' and Ruskin's philosophy. They are convinced that aesthetic experience directly influences man's behaviour, attitudes and work. They emphasise that the masses of workers, first, should be shown how to live. And the way of doing this is to design and build beautiful, healthy factories, homes and gardens for them, to decorate[44] streets and protect the work of previous generations. It is craftsmen' and artists' as well as educators' responsibility and duty to exemplify

---

[41] Arthur C. Danto, *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace. A Philosophy of Art* (Cambridge, Massachussets: Harvard University Press, 1981).

[42] Alan Sinfield, *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 29.

[43] John Fiske, "British Cultural Studies on Television,". in John Storey ed. *What is Cultural Studies? A Reader* (London, New York: Arnold, 1996).

[44] For Morris decoration is free from vulgarity and cheapness.

with their work, thoughts, knowledge, a sense of beauty and how it can be achieved. Obviously, there is room for confusion which may derive either from Ruskin's contradictory views of beauty and art or the large number of modern theories and readings of the issues in question. To avoid both confusion and lengthy discussion of non-relevant points of their philosophy I have chosen to look at their concepts of "decorative"- and "popular"[45] as well as the qualities which, they think, make a man an artist. These topics are central to my investigation because the meanings they employ in relation to work and labour within art and beauty have helped me to find the main building blocks of the structure of their aesthetics which easily hold the weight of their ethical, moral and educative questions. With the theoretical framework of my study being drawn from Cultural Studies I have also examined the meanings of "popular" within its "two paradigms".

By the inquiry into the meanings of hegemony and power in Chapter V I have come upon another difficulty. The complexity of the topic itself would deserve a specific study which is not my objective. Looking at the notions of hegemony and power[46] casually we would easily accept, for example, Eagleton's reasoning, that the power of aesthetics lies in its "pleasurable conduct"[47] and that this is exploited by the hegemonic endeavours of ruling classes to serve their own interest and wealth. In this chapter the fundamental question for me is not to see how completely aesthetics is associated with hegemony and in what major features of power it is expressed in and activated by, but to argue, that parallel with the hegemonic endeavours of aesthetics in the nineteenth century Morris' and Ruskin's art and beauty aiming and intending to

---

[45] Stuart Hall "Notes on Deconstructing " the Popular", in Raphael Samuel ed., *People's History and Socialist Theory.* (London: Routledge, 1981), 227-41, argues that 'poplar' is the expression of power that is different from any other content and expression of power. He speaks of "quantitative marker" that considers things 'popular' just because lots of people buy and listen to them as well as of the "qualitatively" defined "culture of the people". As he is convinced that culture exists only within the frame of class struggles he concludes that "there is *no* whole, authentic, autonomous "popular culture" which lies outside the field of the relations of cultural power and domination" (232).

[46] When talking about power I refer to Foucault's theory He says, "individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application" in *Power, Knowledge, Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977.* Colin Gordon ed. (New York: Pantheom Books. 1980, 98). He examines the power employed and exercised by the bourgeois class of the nineteenth century in relation to phenomena such as infantile sexuality and says that the dominant class is concerned about mechanisms which support their power. Subtle-mechanisms with their ideologies are brought about in the form of education, monarchy etc. And ideology "is the production of effective instruments for the formation and accumulation of knowledge [...] for investigation and research, apparatuses of control. All this means that power, when it is exercised through these subtle mechanisms, cannot but evolve, organise and put into circulation a knowledge, or rather apparatuses of knowledge" (1972, 102).

[47] Terry Eagleton, *The Ideology Of The Aesthetic* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 42.

support the working classes have achieved some power. And the 'route' to this power is not the power of either "pleasurable conduct" or that of the enforcement of a philosophy on masses of people but, first of all, the power of aesthetics based on education that aims to equip people, whatever class culture they have to be able to produce quality and beauty and protect, and learn, from Nature's work. Raymond Williams' views have opened a direction toward the questions of the emergence of "alternative opinions and attitudes, even some alternative senses of the world"[48] and through this, to my concept of Morris' and Ruskin's 'empowered aesthetics". Chapter VI focuses on the set of meanings of *work and labour* initiated by Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics. The notions of work and labour in recent Cultural Studies theories are examined in relation to class, "cultural value and economies of value" (Frow, 1955). Consequently, the main question is what values mental and physical work have or should have and to what extent these values may affect or represent dominance and subordination. In the light of these theories I wanted to examine the power of work and labour leading to ethical, moral and educational issues, the central points of my study. Naturally my aim could not have been to draw a map of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics showing all their views, remarks and observations in relation to work and labour. What I will do is to find the main features and aspects of their theory which hopefully can prove that by showing and teaching man how to perceive and produce beauty in his own degree his life, language, behaviour and even his environment may change. I will construct my discussion around two main topics. One of them is the work of man and the other is the 'work of Nature' which in Morris' and Ruskin's concepts is the 'media' between man and God, and the source of perfection and beauty always being at man's disposal as long as he protects it. I have examined, and in this respect my study reflects what I have already written about their humanism, what Morris and Ruskin mean by perfection, blessedness and happiness in and by work, God's and Nature's work and the power they might convey by man's work. To exemplify these theories I have again chosen the topic of architecture to be more specific. The discussion of how architecture expresses and reflects the power of "the mind and hands may reveal one aspect of Morris' and Ruskin's revolt[49].

---

[48] Raymond Williams *Problems in Materialism and Culture.* (London:Verso, 1980,) 39.

[49] The notion of revolt denotes, first, the main aim of the Pre-Raphaelites. That is, a revolt against academicism. Second, in Morris' view it means to "upset" the power and hegemony of the dominant class and "complete revolution in social conditions". Third, in my reading, the whole process

What follows in Chapter VI leads me to answer the question of which aspects of work and labour support Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics to allow them to construct their ethics and morals by which all classes could live creatively and "aesthetically" and in a manner worthy of a human being. John Fiske's (1996) Alan Sinfield's (1989) and Bernard Williams'[50] concepts will provide a firm basis for the analysis, especially for understanding the meanings of such issues as good, truth, lie and virtue represented by work and labour. The discussion of ethics is the result of my viewing Morris' and Ruskin's philosophy as one way of 'empowering aesthetics', and within which there are points in relation to work and labour that decisively articulate answers to question of 'how'. To understand their 'aesthetic ethics' I will emphasise that one of the most crucial features of Morris's and Ruskin's ethics is that man's work should have aesthetic forms. This means, man can bear both the mental and physical 'burden' of work and can value others' and nature's work if his gestures, language and behaviour show the hallmark of 'beauty'. I consider Chapter VIII as a bridge which helps to understand how theories of ethics and morals derived from the realm of aesthetics lead to the question of practice. The latter is also a crucial point of my analysis because the theories introduced into and applied in everyday practices evidently influence people and institutions more directly and 'decisively' than those which remained on paper waiting to be read and worked with. By examining briefly the structure and the policy of the Victorian educational system while applying John Clarke's (1981) and Raymond Williams' (1980) views of culture in terms of education as well as Gramsci's[51] theory of power regarding organisation and activities of schools I will prepare the ground for the analysis of the last stage of Morris' and Ruskin's *'empowered aesthetics'*. Without discussing too closely education in the Victorian age I will structure my reasoning around the views which help to understand the reasons for changing the whole system

---

which embraces ethics, morals and education within the realm of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics so as to change, produce beauty and perfection. (For details of Ruskin's socialist views see J.A. Hobson, *John Ruskin Social Reformer* (London: James Nisbet, 1898).

[50] Bernard Williams, *Ethics And The Limits Of Philosophy* Frank Kermode ed. (London: Fontana Masterguides, 1985).

[51] Antonio Gramsci, *Selections From The Prison Notebooks. "On Education"* Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith eds. (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), 26-43.

of English education and see how modern[52] views want education to affect people's minds and through this the whole society. In this respect Mathew Arnold's[53] concepts have helped me to have an insight into the main questions of education within which Morris' and Ruskin's answers initiated by their aesthetics could be placed.

In Chapter VIII I will address the issues of Change, Quality of Change in Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics and are often raised in relation to their notion of revolt[54]. I want to deal with only one aspect of change. That is, the one which should be brought about by art and beauty. I will examine their dilemma of to what extent a sensitive man should change both professionally and personally so as to be able to work creatively and live 'beautifully'[55]. I want to lay emphasis on *change* because Ruirkin's and Morris's interpretation of work and labour, in my opinion, may make us see the far fetched social, cultural, ethical and educative consequences and effects on man's physical and mental activities[56].

The final chapter of the study has had no difficulties and traps for me as the previous ones. To view Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics as a unifying thread in a process which embraces ethics, morals and education so that work and labour could initiate a revolt against "aesthetic bareness"[57], unhappy mechanical work and the norm, and values of "dominant culture" (Clarke et al., 1981) has made me rethink and analyse what Morris' and Ruskin's views of art and beauty could add to our

---

[52] The word "modern" here denotes the views of Victorian teachers, teacher educators and politicians different both in their objectives and means from those who insisted on not 'touching' the old traditions.

[53] Matthew Arnold, *God And The Bible* ed , R.H. Super. (Michigan: Longmans, 1970).

[54] For the set of meanings the notion of revolt conveyed in the Aestheticism of Victorian England I consulted Elisabeth Prettejohn ed. *After the Pre-Raphaelites' Art and Aestheticism in Victorian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press), 1999.

[55] I will offer its meanings in Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics in chapter 7.

[56] What is worth mentioning in terms of man's activities in the twentieth century is the fact that in, for example, Bill Williamson's view in his article entitled, "Learning the Language of the Job. Jobs and Identity in Twentieth Century Britain," *Journal For The Study Of British Cultures* Vol. 7 – No. 2/00 (2000): 97 the meanings and practices of *work and labour* did not alter to such a great extant in the previous century so that theorists could raise different questions from the ones that were posed in the Victorian times. And these are the followings:

Who should control work?
How should .it be paid for and measured?
What are the rights of the workers?
How can its dehumanising aspects be removed?
How can successful work be celebrated?

[57] Graeme Turner, *British Cultural Studies* (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), 39..

understanding of Victorian culture and civilisation. The vastness of the topic warns me to avoid arriving at excessively firm positions concerning these questions. Naturally there are answers, but whatever answers I will have throughout the study they can raise several others. Therefore, with the set of questions I will list in the concluding phase of Chapter IX I want to show that William Morris' and John Ruskin's aesthetics (independent of time and place) exemplify the practice of a philosophy that may counterbalance hegemony. And the ethical and moral questions of work and labour initiated and generated by the concepts of art and beauty can help people support the oppressive burden of labour forced upon them. The crucial point of my conclusion is to emphasise the role and responsibilities of education in equipping people with skills, abilities and knowledge by which they will be able to enquire, critically handle and deal with theories and decide which criteria, norms and values may help them to produce beauty[58] and work of high quality. In this respect, I hope to be able to make it explicit. that ethics, morals and education rooted in aesthetics, whose meanings and principles differ from hegemonic concepts of art and beauty, may affect people's attitude toward work and labour, their behaviour, language and way of life.

Chapter 2 Theoretical Framework

In this chapter my aims and objectives are:

- to establish a theoretical basis for understanding the intellectual content and the range of activities within the *civilisation and culture* in which William Morris' and John Ruskin's aesthetics is embedded
- to understand how their concepts of *art and beauty* lead to the discussion and re-evaluation of the professional and personal worth of man in the light of his *work and labour*, and
- to show what power Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics may have in the fight/revolt against those created to maintain and serve hegemony[59] in Victorian society

---

[58] By the notion of beauty I mean Morris' and Ruskin's set of meanings discussed in chapter 4..

[59] By hegemony I mean the definition of Clareke et al.. (1981) quoted in chapter 6.

In my attempt to grasp the essence of the diverse theories within Cultural Studies I will follow the concepts of Graeme Turner (1990) [60], John Storey[61] and Tony Bennett et al.[62] and the way they view the philosophies of Cultural Studies. I will not try discuss the whole of this theoretical field. Of necessity I will focus mainly on the concepts on which this study is based on. Besides English theorists, for example, Tony Bennett, Jonathan Dollimore, Terry Eagleton, John Fiske, Richard Hoggart, Alan Sinfield, and Raymond Williams I will apply non-British thinkers, mainly Antonio Gramsci's (1971) and Michel Foucault's (1980) ideas deeply affecting the theoretical orientation and practice of British Cultural Studies.

Cultural Studies which is deeply rooted in England emerged in the 1950s and developed after the establishment of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham.[63]. As Bill Schwartz sees it "the early project of cultural studies in England was the transportation of the qualitative - aesthetic and ethical - co-ordinates associated with literary criticism to the practices of lived or popular cultures"[64] Post-war Britain is its context, when, in Turner's (1990) opinion, generations start experiencing the revival of capitalist industrial mass production; the first signs of the establishment of a welfare state. 'Modernity' brings about the Americanisation of popular culture as well as evoking interest in the nature of working-class culture. Matthew Arnold's[65] worries appear to be confirmed by the

---

[60] Turner claims (1990, 61) that Cultural Studies theorist such as Raymond Williams has found an answer to his views of 'determination' in Gramsci's theory of hegemony. When applying Gramsci's concept I will also keep in mind Bennett's criticism regarding the Gramscinian tradition in his work entitled, "Putting policy into cultural studies," (Storey 1966, 307-321). He observes that "it commits us to too automatic a politics, one which- since it contends that all cultural activities are bound into struggle for hegemony - is essentially the same no matter what the region of its application. The Gramscinian moment in cultural studies, in consequence, has tended to be institutionally indifferent and, accordingly, has paid insufficient attention to those considerations which, in differentiating cultural technologies one from another; give rise to specific sets of political relations and forms of calculation" (1966, 315).

[61] John Storey ed., *What is Cultural Studies? A Reader* (London: Arnold), 1966.

[62] Tony Bennett et al. eds. *Culture, Ideology and Social Process. A Reader.* (Philadelphia: Open University Press), 1981

[63] Its journal is the Working Papers in Cultural Studies.

[64] Bill Schwartz, "Where Is Cultural Studies?" *Cultural Studies* 8 (3) (1994):380. To have a much wider idea of how the notion of culture is viewed it is worth reading Roy Wagner, *Invention of Culture* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1975).

[65] Matthew. Arnold *Culture And Anarchy*. Samuel Lipman ed.(New Haven: Yale University Press,) 1869.

"aesthetic barrenness" (Turner 1990, 39) which becomes the main quality of the new culture. Bill Schwartz observes that there are two main "historical determinations" (1994, 382) that contribute to the emergence of Cultural Studies. That is, the collapse of the British Empire and the downfall of the colonial empires. He is also right to claim that besides all these facts we have to become conscious of the effect of television, rock music, "mass circulation of journals, newspapers [..] massively inflated the channels through which popular cultural forms could circulate, and which intensified the transformation of 'art' into lived or popular culture" (1994, 181). Cultural Studies is rooted in Marxist, non-Marxist, and post Marxist intellectual traditions. In John Storey's opinion "Marxism informs cultural studies in two fundamental ways.

- first, to understand the meanings of culture we must analyses it in relation to the social structure and its historical contingency.
- second, cultural studies assumes that capitalist industrial societies are societies divided unequally along ethnic, gender, generational and class line [..] culture is terrain on which takes place a continual struggle over meaning, in which subordinate groups attempt to resist the imposition of meanings which bear the interest of dominant groups" (1990, 3).

It is necessary to stress that the main theoretical line of this study will not be the analysis of the Marxist tradition and its effects on the development of cultural formations and philosophy. The aim here is not to redirect attention to the Marxists theories but rather, to apply views as one way of exploring the features of aesthetics of Victorian age through which ethical, moral and educative questions are approached and discussed. Out of many definitions I have found Richard Johnson's definition worth quoting. He writes, Cultural Studies "can be defined as an intellectual and political tradition, in relation to the academic disciplines, in terms of theoretical paradigms, or by its characteristic objects of study"[66]. For him the single word culture is a "kind of summation of a history. It references in particular the effort to heave the study of culture from its inegalitarian anchorages in high-artistic connoisseurship and in discourses, of enormous condescension, on the not–culture of the masses" (79). He goes on to say that behind the intellectual tradition there is a "less consistent *political*

[66] Johnson, Richard, "What is Cultural Studies Anyway?" In John Storey ed. *What is* Cultural Studies? A Reader (London: Arnold, 1966), 78.

pattern, a continuity that runs from the first new left and the first Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament to the post –1968 currents" (79). Johnson also points out, there has been a tendency to reform the old left politics, and emphasises that Cultural Studies is not a "research programme" for a specific party. Rather, a complex way of analysing and understanding social, cultural and political phenomena. The "sense of cultural studies as a political project" is discussed at length by Graeme Turner (1990, 214). What is worth highlighting in the way he sees Cultural Studies in relation to politics both as a project, and a practice is the following: He says that this engagement includes "the media's representation of the unions and industry; critiques of government policies in schooling, policing, heritage management, media regulation and urban planning, and so on" (215). He also observes that from the beginning the analysis and practice of Cultural Studies have challenged political power, yet "it has its own politics, its own allocations and distribution of power" (218). It is also necessary to mention that the development of ideology and theories can be divided into the American[67] and the European lines. The latter involves the work of, for example, Lévi-Strauss, Barthes, Lacan, Althusser and Gramsci. According to the Gramscian[68] theory of hegemony the cultural domination of the ruling classes is the result of a 'tacit' consensus between the dominant and the subdominant classes. They accept domination because they are convinced that under this 'umbrella' they will be able to enforce their own claims and rights. The ideology of the *British tradition* is based mainly on the concepts of Raymond Williams (1966), Richard Hoggart, and E.P Thompson[69] As Turner (1990) sees its theoretical development and changes begin in 1970s and 80s and there is an attempt to respond to structuralism and post-structuralism. The other main issue within the philosophy of Cultural Studies is the difference between the "two paradigms"[70], that is, 'the two rather different way of conceptualising 'culture' within the *culturalist's* and the *structuralist* concepts. Easthope summarises the key concepts

---

[67] In the United States it was during the 1980s and 1990s when cultural studies became the focus of academic interest. New journals appeared, for example, Cultural Critique, Differences, Representations and Social Text.

[68] I will apply his ideas to understand how *work and labour* within the realm of aesthetics can be 'charged' with power in opposition to that of current hegemony in Chapters 4 and 7..

[69] E. P. Thompson, *The Making Of The English Working Class* (New York, London: :Penguin Books, 1963).

[70] Stuart Hall, "Cultural studies: two paradigms." In John Storey ed. *What is Cultural Studies? A Reader* (London: Arnold, 1966), 31- 49.

of these approaches by saying that either individual or collective subjects are "culturally expressive"[71] and that, in contrast to this idea, others claim that everything in a culture is coded and determined by structures. In other words, *Structuralism* suggests that Cultural Studies theorists should consider both individual experience and practical experience too 'loose' "to read working class culture for the values and meanings embodied in its patterns and arrangements as if they were certain kinds of 'text' " (Hall 1966, 32). The structuralist approach is that culture "is determined in advance by structures which are both social and signifying" (Easthope, 1988, 74-75). In other words, the basis of the analysis should be less slippery and leaky than that of individual perceptions and experience. A clear-cut structure, for example, language should be used to attain answers. Hall (1966) points out that in the perspective of the structuralists experience cannot serve as a basis of analysis since, says Hall, "one could only 'live' and experience one's conditions *in and through* the categories, classifications and frameworks of the culture" (1966, 41). He remarks that it is an error to contribute the breakdown of Marxist structuralism only to the impact of Althusser. It is Lévi-Strauss and the early semioticians who primarily affected the Marxist ideology. Hall goes on to say that the Althusserian[72] models stress "the determining nature and quality within the articulation of *ideology* and its relationship with *the state* the "expressive conception of the totality" (41). I would also mention the Screen project which set out to deal with Marxism and psychoanalysis within the realm of semiotics. Its theories are mainly based on Althusser (1971, 121-173).

In opposition to the structuralists paradigm the *culturalists see* behind the concept of culture see general processes described in literary works which may initiate conversations. The meanings, in Williams' (1961) view, are synthesised by these

---

[71] Anthony Easthope, *British Post-Sructuralism Since 1968* (London and New York: Routledfe, 1988), 75.

[72] Louis Althusser, *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" In Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays.* Trans. Ben Brewster. (London: New Left Books, 1971). One of my reasons for not applying Althusserian concepts in this study is that my aim has not been to show determinations between practices of dominant and sub-dominant cultures and institutes set up by the state. What I will show is that that the central idea of Ruskin's and Morris' aesthetics is that whatever class-culture people represent by developing their sense of beauty through their *work and labour* they may change their values, ethics and morals regarding Nature, language, architecture and their environment They accept the state both as a structure and power and emphasise that it primarily should function and activate its 'power' so as to educate creative individuals sensitised to the beauty by their and others' work as well as to God's work transmitted by the beauty of Nature into our earthly life.
To understand the relationship between power and art it is worth mentioning Sinfield's views which stress the role of the state in welfare-capitalism claiming, "state support was the new factor , and it was decisive in recognising the status and ideological role of literature and the arts" (1989, 53)

'discourses' which will be built in the different spheres of a society and as soon as they have been verbalised and perhaps practised they start being active. This idea is the basis of my concept of 'empowered aesthetics'. Being aware of the tensions and difficulties regarding the available meanings and views of culture as well as the tendency towards redefining it I will sum up briefly what the main points of the culturalist approach are in relation to culture by quoting Hall's views, " The conception of 'culture' is itself democratised and socialised. It no longer consists of the sum of the "best that has been thought and said' [...] Even 'art' [...] is redefined as only one, special, form of a general social process: the giving and taking of meanings, and the slow development of 'common' meanings" (1966, 33). Raising the issue of art[73] within the theories of Cultural Studies makes me quote Raymond Williams' line of thought, "The art is there [in the society] as an activity, with the production, the trading, the politics, the raising of families. To study the relations adequately we must study them actively, seeing all the activities as particular and contemporary forms of human energy" (1981, 45-46). The notion of popular culture[74] in the context of Cultural Studies "is understood to comprehend both practices and texts, practices as forms of 'lived experience' in which signification is not dominant and texts as forms of signifying practice in which it is" (Easthope 1988, 75). Talking about the two paradigms of Cultural Studies in Chapter II, I think, it is worth examining the difference between the meanings of these two attitudes in relation to the term "popular". Structuralism works with definitions such as 'mass culture' and 'dominant culture' says Bennett[75]. Their major objective is to use popular forms and practices to equip the reader with knowledge and abilities to be able to recognise the mechanism of the dominant ideology and to avoid working with similar practices. The culturalists distinguish "popular" from and opposed to dominant ideology

---

[73] As the topic of art and beauty is a big segment of this dissertation further details of modern debate will be offered in chapter 4.

[74] Among the practices such traditional pastimes are also involved as throwing at cocks and eating of 'kets'. (Easthope 1988, 75). Tim Rowse," The Trouble and Hegemony: Popular Culture and Multiculturalism," *Politics* (Nov. 1985): 71, argues that in class terms 'popular culture' cannot be discussed, as it constitutes audiences that cut across classes. Frow warns us that we should not make a definite distinction between 'high' and 'low/'mass culture' in relations to popular as they "represent a division that is operative within all cultural domains" (1995, 25). Simon Frith, "The Good, the Bad, and the Indifference: defending Popular Culture from the Populist" *Diacritics*, 21:4 (1991):109, organises cultural field around three 'discourses'. In his view, there are a "discourse of art" (concerned with the transendence of body and place), a 'folk' discourse (concerned with integration in a community), and a 'popular' discourse (concerned with cultural experience) (1991, 109).

within the frame of mass culture. As soon as they have identified a "people's voice" they will interpret its meaning, context and tone. Both approaches view culture through two large cultural and ideological categories, that is to say, bourgeois and working class.

To have a less blurred vision of current usages and lines of thinking surrounding the theories of Cultural Studies I will also emphasise its two main ideologies represented by *Cultural Materialism* (Williams, Dollimore, Sinfield) and *New Historicism.* The reason for treating at some length these concepts is that the different 'theoretical branches' of Cultural Studies do not function in isolation, there are shifting boundaries between these theories. As must have been clear so far, there are no ideas purely attached to one group of theories or the other, there are concepts which look at and investigate the same notions from different angles. And, this is what I will do in my study. I will not insist on applying solely one or two theorists' views. I will attempt to approach the problems and issues in question from the perspective of views which may enhance our understanding the most. What is worth highlighting in terms of Cultural Materialism is the following comment "they have re-evaluated the relationship between past and present [...] and remind the reader that texts do have a history and that knowing historical conditions can enrich one's understanding and appreciation of literature"[76]. New Historicism has been influenced by Michel Foucault's views of power relations and Jacques Derrida's deconstruction theory. Quite exactly I will apply Foucault's (1980) thoughts and perceptions to exemplify to what extent and how architecture is used to express and practise different human interests behind which the power of "dominant cultures" is reflected. Then in the context of Morris's and Ruskin's aesthetics I will discuss the power[77] implied and conveyed by architecture.

---

[75] Tony Bennett, "Introduction: popular culture and the turn to Gramsci" in Tony Bennett, Colin Mercer and Janet Woollacott eds. *Popular Culture and Social Relations. A Reader* (Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1986), 11-28.

[76] Irena R. Makaryk, *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 25.

[77] It must be emphasised that this power is different both in context and principles from the power that is used and applied for serving mammon at the cost of exploiting people's 'minds and hands'. Attempting to see how, for example, hospital architecture was "inscribed in social space" (1972, 146) in the second half of the eighteenth century Foucault arrives at concluding that architecture begins at the end of the eighteenth century to become involved in problems of population, health and urban questions. Previously, the art of building corresponded to the need to make power, divinity and might manifest. The palace and the church were the great architectural form, along with the stronghold. Architecture manifested Might, the Sovereign, the God. Its development was for long centred on these requirements. Then, late in the 18th century, new problems emerge, it becomes a question of using the disposition of

The most striking difference between the two concepts is in their textual interpretation (1993, 24). Cultural Materialists "focus on the subversion of dominant ideologies and institutions represented in literature, while the Historicists emphasise containment in asserting that the dominant is necessarily defined by the subversion it controls" (Makaryk 1993, 29). Naturally there is an interrelationship' between these theories, which can be exemplified by the fact that Jonathan Dollimore's and Alan Sinfield's[78] articles have been included in the New Historicist studies as well as Stephen Greenblatt's[79] wording of "cultural poetics" instead of New Historicism. Cultural Studies has been also affected by the challenges of feminism and of sexual politics. In Schwartz's opinion "Recognition of the gendered determinations of culture rearranged the whole field of work" (1994, 383). He goes on to say, "Power itself came to be reconceptualised, with the varied sites of the personal and the private assuming a quite new centrality in cultural explanation" (384). He mentions the theories of Lacan leading to the recovery of psychoanalysis. Schwartz claims that cultural studies in the 1980s "arrived at the vortex of post-structuralism and deconstruction" which dominated this period.

As the focus of this study is on aesthetics, art and beauty I will base my arguments on Fred Inglis'[80] views. His opinion has supported my way of seeing Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics in a structure which relate art, education, morals and ethics to each other by the concepts of work and labour.

In the next chapter I will establish the theoretical background of civilisation and culture as well as cultures which will lead to the central question of this study, that is *work and labour*. As a way of exploring how Morris' and Ruskin's

---

space for economico-political ends (1980, 148). Foucault refers to Bentham who recognises that the structure of a building or a house can concentrate on expressing power either of individuals or representatives and executors of ruling classes. "He invented a technology of power designed to solve the problem of surveillance. One important point should be noted, that is, Bentham thought and said that his optical system[77] was the great innovation needed for the easy and effective exercise of power" e.g. in schools, hospitals, prisons, military buildings (148). Regarding labour he suggests that it has triple functions: "the productive function, the symbolic function and the function of dressage, or discipline" (161).

[78] Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield eds., *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985).

[79] Steephen Greenblatt, "Towards a Cultural Poetics". In H. Aram Veeser ed. *The New Historicism*. (New York: Routledge, 1989), 1-14. .Grenblatt's views are discussed in György Endre Szőnyi's article, entitled "Az 'újhistoricizmus' és a mai amerikai Shakespeare-kutatás," *Helikon* 1-2 44. (1998): 11-23.

[80] Fred Inglis *Cultural Studies* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers (1993).

concepts of art and beauty relate interactively with ethical and educative process shaping and forming actions, specific theories and practices of culture I will offer the set of meanings which I will be working with throughout this study. My aim here is not to expand the field of this analysis to such a vast and complex topic as the notions of civilisation and culture, but to identify and clarify the points of Morris' and Ruskin's philosophy which redefine Victorian ethics, morals and education and, through these realms, civilisation and culture.

3 Civilisation And Culture

3.1 Bridging "Dominant and Subdominant Cultures"[81]

By applying mainly .the theories of Tony Bennett et al.. (1981), Clarke et al.. (1981), Richard Hoggart (1957, 1969[82]), Raymond Williams[83] and Paul Willis[84] I intend to work with views and definitions which may guide our understanding of the qualities of Morris's and Ruskin's philosophy which, in my view, has contributed to bring about their aesthetics bearing power different at several levels, both in its content, principles and meanings from that whose main function is to reinforce and maintain the power of Victorian hegemony.

As indicated above, first, a set of meanings of *civilisation and culture* will be offered. Considering the theoretical diversity of these notions I will use the concepts which expand these questions also to the following issues:

classes

working class

work and labour[85]

---

[81] Clarke (1981, 55.).

[82] Richard Hoggart *Contemporary Cultural Studies. An Approach to the Study of Literature and Society.* Occasional paper No 6. (Birmingham University of Birmingham), 1969.

[83] Williams, *Culture and Society Coleridge to Orwell* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1958).

[84] Paul Willis *Learning to Labour* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1978.
As the focus of the dissertation is not on the analysis of Cultural Studies, therefore the list of theorists cannot be complete. For an excellent and detailed overview of the topic I also consulted Graeme Turner (1990, 38-75).

[85] The analysis of the notions of *work and labour* will serve as a prime means of attempting to answer my questions raised in chapter 1.

Second, William Morris' and John Ruskin's concepts of culture will be discussed by strictly focusing on these points. In doing so, my aim is to show the features, such as their "snowball image"[86] of civilisation and culture through their aesthetics. Naturally by looking at the concepts of *civilisation* my aim is not to arrive at a settled meaning rather it is to offer a clear line of thought synthesising the complex meaning of the notion in relation to culture. As Routh puts it,

> Civilisation tends to unite the community in the bonds of mental dependence and therefore involves one serious disadvantage. It threatens to render an individual less and less master of himself. He does not only divide and distribute his actions among all the claims of social service, but he dissipates and diminishes his consciousness of his invisible self. He has many parts to play. Fortunately civilisation also brings, at most, epochs, an influence which counteracts this disintegration – some interest, art, allegiance or exaltation which restores a man to consciousness of his inmate self. Such is culture. If civilisation unravels our personality into a hundred threads, culture reweaves them into a new and fairer design[87].

It is also worth mentioning here Rob Pope's view of *civilisation.* He points out the relationship between civilisation and Nature concluding that "human civilisation is set against (rather than alongside or in harmony with) the rest of nature. From the eighteenth-century onwards it became increasingly common to see human culture, for better and worse, as hardly part of nature. In these cases, Culture= Humanity and – Nature."[88]. Civilisation in the light of this relationship is emphasised here because the central questions of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics are also set up around these issues. Although their cultural, social, historical context and their experience in terms of Nature, Humanity and Culture are different from those of the theorists in the twentieth-century, approaching the notions of *civilisation and culture* through these questions, in my view, opens the way to detect the contents, the levels of power and

---

[86] John Ruskin *Political Economy of Art* (London: Routlege, 1907), 72.

[87] Routh, *Towards The Twentieth Century. Essays In The Spiritual History Of The Nineteenth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937), 155.

[88] Rob Pope, *The English Studies Book* (London: Routledge, 1998), 60.

the far-reaching influence[89] of Morris' and Ruskin's and the Pre-Raphaelites' aesthetics.

3.1.2 Culture, cultures?

Raymond Williams thinks that 'civilisation' and 'culture' were interchangeable terms in the late eighteenth-century carrying "the problematic sense of an achieved state and of an achieved state of development"[90]. In his opinion through Romanticism the sense of 'culture' as an 'inner' or a 'spiritual' process distinct from 'external' development. becomes the focus. Later culture means a general classification of the arts, religion, and the institution and practices of meanings and values. Trying to define culture Williams suggests using three general categories so as to develop a more refined way of seeing the notion. First he mentions the "ideal" category in which culture represents universal values supporting the achievement of human perfection, the "document" one sets upon the notion of a culture which is the "the body of intellectual and imaginative work". Lastly, the 'social' category describing "a particular way of life, which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning but also institutions and ordinary behaviour" (1981, 43-52). I see the significance of Williams' concept of culture in relation to art in the following line of thought

> The arts of writing and the arts of creation and performance, over their whole range, are parts of the cultural process in all the different ways, the different sectors [..]. They contribute to the effective dominant culture and are a central articulation of it. They embody residual meanings and values, not all of which are incorporated, though many are. They express also and significantly some emergent practices and meanings, yet some of these may eventually be incorporated, as they reach people and begin to move them[91]

In Routh's views, if we want to understand ourselves and the world around us then not the sequence of events of our culture but rather that of the ideas are to be understood; "the forms and formulas by which our intellect, have revealed or concealed our

---

[89] The question I will raise in the conclusion show that Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics touches upon issues that are still valid and waiting for answers.

[90] Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1977), 14--18.

[91] Raymond Williams *Problems in Materialism and Culture* (London: Verso, 1980),44.

innermost feelings [as we]. cannot render even a flower poetical unless you think of it as something more than a flower, as a type of beauty, our expression of nature, or a creation of God" (1937, 3-5). Clarke et al. differentiate between the meaning of the singular and plural forms of the word culture. They say that in a society there are several classes. It is capitalism[92] which brings two "*different* classes-capital and labour" together. This means that in this structure there is always "one class which represents itself as the *culture*, that is the dominant one" (Clarke et al., 1981, 55). They define the 'culture' of a group or class in the following way "it is the particular and distinctive 'way of life' of a group or class, the meanings, values and ideas embodied in institutions, in social relations, in systems of beliefs, in *mores* and customs, in the uses of objects and material life" (53). It is the, "the maps of meaning" that express their power through which the culture legitimise its interests and influence. From it follows that there are *cultures* in which differently ranked groups and classes are in some relation to one another depending on their wealth and power. Thus, these cultures "stand in relations of domination and sub domination" to one another. In their opinion the meaning of *culture*, represented by "capital" can be understood only if it is examined in relation to these *cultures*. I would also like to suggest that Gramsci makes an important point in relation to culture. He observes, "It is organisation, discipline of one's inner self, a coming to terms with one's own personality; it is the attainment of a higher awareness, with the aid of which one succeeds in understanding one's own historical value, one's own function in life, one's own rights and obligations" (1981, 194) Richard Hoggart[93] expands these spheres of culture to rituals, gestures and structures being expressed in the traditionally-defined forms of art. It is also worth mentioning Eileen Yeo's (1981, 155) opinion about the culture of the nineteenth

---

[92] To define capitalism I have borrowed the definition of Eileen and Stephen Yeo eds. from their book entitled, *Ways of Seeing: Control and Leisure versus Class and Struggle* ". (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1981), 136. In their view capitalism "a system which had, through its nature, enclosed, privileged, and privatised economic ownership was trying to extend that privilege into desire, self-and-mutual government. A new class of managers in many different branches of production was to be the instrument of such attempts". What Jean-Francois Lyotard says in "Rules and Paradoxes and Svelte Appendix.," trans. Brian Massumi. *Cultural Critique*, 5 (Winter 1986-7), 209-219. is also worth quoting "Capitalism is one of the names modernity goes by. It consisted in the retraction of the infinite into an instance that had already been designated by Descartes (and perhaps by Augustine, the first modern) Capitalism posits the infinite as that which is not yet determined, as that which will must indefinitely master and appropriate. The infinite bears the names of cosmos, energy, and research and development.." (215-216).

[93] Richard Hoggart, *Contemporary Cultural Studies. An Approach to the Study of Literature and Society* (Burmingham: University of Burmingham, 1969) 3.

century in relation to its new meanings and content. She claims that we should take account of a new development, that is, the organised social movements. This is one segment of culture the working people are making for themselves, says Yeo.

As *classes*[94] are often mentioned in this study in the context of Morris's and Ruskin's aesthetics I will deal with this notion, and later in this chapter, examine the meanings of class/classes in Victorian[95] culture through Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics. To establish the meaning of *class* I will apply Pierre Bourdieu's (1987) concept restricting[96] its scope to the sphere of '*working classes*'. The reason for doing so is that the central point of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics, in my view, is the role, value and quality of *work and labour* of the working classes. To the question "of what makes a social class" Bourdieu's answer is the following

> social, sexual, ethnic, or otherwise exists when there are agents capable of imposing themselves, as authorised to speak and to act officially in its place and in its name, upon whose those who [....] by recognising them as endowed with full power to speak and act in their name, recognise themselves as members of the class, and in doing so, confer upon it the only form of existence a group can possess (15).

He goes on to suggest that classes are "sets of agents" (7) who by possessing and sharing power based on similar interests, existence and aims become the participants of the same practices. In order to discover the main points of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics which may enhance our understanding of how their concepts of *work and labour* have induced the process of 'empowered aesthetics" it is essential to look at the meanings and concepts of *working classes*. This is not to say that Morris and Ruskin neglect dominant class/classes or I would be unaware of other classes of the nineteenth century. I am aware of the components, structure and functions of classes, but when I turn to consider the notion of *work and labour* in Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics

---

[94] Here I do not intend to give a thorough philosophical, theoretical and historical overview of this word, or analyse how Marx' concepts have been applied by the theorists of Cultural Studies and in what points they differ from each other. I will be 'working' with two theorists' concepts which, in my opinion, offer first, a more general view of the notion of class/classes, then, help me narrow down the question to the term of working classes.

[95] Patricia Hall's book entitled, *Class and Conflict in the Nineteenth Century England 1815-1850.* (London: and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973) offers valuable details and explanations.

[96] This restriction will not mean the neglect of other classes. They will also be in the focus of the analysis but, in my opinion, it is the issue of working classes which suggests a more detailed definition.

which is built around the economic, social, cultural and ethical questions of the *working classes* I cannot avoid exploring it in some detail. Alan Hunt suggests that the term of working class is often used to refer to "either factory workers" or "wage earners" which is an indiscriminate way of defining the notion. In his view there should be a choice between two categories. One, in a broad sense, taking "the working class as being composed of all those who sell their labour power, and, thus, embraces all wage and salary earners. Within this category the crucial question is the "unity of the working class" [97]. The other category is the 'narrow" one which involves the "productive labourers or factory workers". He thinks that the working class constitutes not only a small, but also a declining proportion of the total population. In Tom Nairn's[98] view the most striking feature of the working class is 'reason' which has never characterised the bourgeoisie. 'Reason' has equipped the English working class with abilities and knowledge enabling them to become a 'hegemonic force' and developed elements of consciousness. He is convinced that the major failure of both the English and European working classes has been their incapacity to shake off 'capital'. Thompson (1963) observes that the formation of the working class has been based on not only economic forces, but this class has also 'worked' within specific cultural and social formations against these forces. In his view by 1832 the appearance of trade unions, educational and religious movements, and political organisations of the working classes show the increasing self-consciousness of the working classes. He emphasises the traditions of the working class intellectuals as well as a "working-class structure of feeling" (213). Richard Hoggart offers a thorough analysis of the British working class. For him the working classes are those "who live in the miles of smoking and huddled working-class houses in Leeds". He voices his problem when trying to define the notion of working classes due to "the mass publications" saying that this notion is often identified with words like "the common people" and "lower middle class" (1957, 18-19)..

To uncover the main qualities of Victorian culture concerning class and classes I will look at:

---

[97] Alan Hunt , "Theory and Politics in the Identification of the Working Class," in Alan Hunt ed. *Class And Class Structure* (London: Lawrence And Wishart, 1977), 83-85.
Geoff Hodgson's idea is similar. He writes in his book entitled, *Labour At The Crossroads.* (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1981) "working class is composed of the manual labour force and those living on state benefits" .(51)

[98] Tom Nairn, "The English Working Class," New left Review, nov. 24 (March/April) (1964):

- the main social and intellectual tendencies and changes of the age which, in my view, may have affected the meaning of classes and examine
- how the notions of *civilisation and culture* as well *class*[99] formations are viewed. by Morris and Ruskin in the light of these changes .

In Eagleton's words the English society has already had "its take-off, arguably on the back of the enormous profits it has reaped from the eighteenth-century slave trade and its imperial control of the seas, to become the world's first industrial capitalist nation"[100]. Regarding the changes of the age John Vincent Morley comments, " Every age is in some sort an age of transition, but our is characteristically and cardinally an epoch of transition in the very formulation of belief and conduct"[101]. Altick emphasises that what the Victorians call culture is "the classical Christian and the Renaissance ideal of human perfection of the intellect's feelings and imagination developed in harmony" [102]. He also remarks that principles of traditional humanism are still valid in trying to find ways to solve serious problems and the altered social conditions[103]. In order to have an overview of to what extent *altered social conditions* interfere with people's life in the nineteenth-century I have used Altick's (1974, 241-242) and Young's[104] perceptions. They speak of *fears and hopes*. which are the followings:

FEARS	**HOPES**
The traditional culture will be vulgarised, levelled down to the lowliest common denominator of taste,	Society's duty to educate it up toward the élitist level of culture.

52-53.

[99] When dealing with these notions I will not attempt to offer a detailed picture of their content, structure and functions in the Victorian area. I only want to emphasise their qualities within Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics by concentrating on *work and labour*.

[100] Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory* (Oxford: Oxford Basil Blackwell, 1983), 19.

[101] John Vincent Morley, *On Compromise* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1933), 14-15.

[102] D.R. Altick, *Victorian People* (London: J.M. Dent, 1974), 238.

[103] For data and detailed descriptions of how the structure of the society altered in the Victorian age especially in relation to the working classes see Henry Mayhew, *London, Labour And The London Poor* (London: Penguin,) 1972.

[104] G.M. Young, *Portrait Of An Age. Victorian England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960), 13-25.

Charity schools set the majority of working people to penny thrillers and sensational newspapers instead of literature, Loss of personal identity in factories and Slums. Along with mass production, progressive commerce people start feeling dependence and restriction. The upper class concern took a new direction; Gresham's law let free operation of the cultural market. Christian responsibility is not a duty in economic life any longer. Physical separation of families and communities start. The society becomes more and more dependent on machines.	It is possible to enrich an ordinary's man tastes and interests so that, far from destroying that culture, he could profitably participate in it according to his capabilities, and enhance it through the special qualities of perception he derived from experience in an inferior rank of society. The new Englishman , a travelled man bred up on Carlyle and Tennyson. For them it is the age of learning.

Joan Burstin's views about life and living conditions also take me to the core of the points raised in this chapter, that is, the features of Victorian civilisation, culture and class. What she says is,

> The Victorians became obsessed with the need to provide public bathhouse, sewage systems, and street lightening. They looked also to a refinement of individual manners as a way to make city life more bearable and to bring self-respect to the city worker, because Victorian cities were viable only so long as

all classes were prepared to live together without violence. All people, therefore were set a standard of refinement temperance, delicacy of language, prudence, and self-denial (usually phrased in Christian terms)- which the ruling classes believed would enable them better their own and their family status [105].

Also in Burstin's opinion "class in Victorian society was defined through a subtle combination of occupation, income, and values; [...] Definitions of a class were linked to the occupation and incomes of males. Females were assigned a class according to the status of their fathers so long as they were unmarried, and of their husband's income they were married" (12). This civilisation is against the "standard of truth", says Morris[106] bitterly, and the work, especially the ordinary modern houses cannot move anything in us and "save a hope that we may speedily forget its base ugliness?" (1931, 112). Morris' also says regarding Victorian civilisation that "it seems to me, [civilisation] owes us some compensation for the loss of romance"[107]. By this he means clear air, clean rivers, mountains free from fences and the "loss of the instinct of beauty". He remarks,

> I had thought that civilisation meant the attainment of peace and order and freedom, of goodwill between man and man, of the love of truth and the hatred of injustice. [...] not more cushions, and more carpets and glass, and more dainty meat and drink- and therewithal more and sharper differences between class and class[108].

This civilisation deprives masses of people of freedom, "cushions, carpets and glass". in the early nineteenth-century. They cannot even dream of this luxury when, as Eileen Yeo observes, they are notoriously hard up for both money and time. In work working hours are long, and workers' incomes equally low in the 'advanced' mechanized factory sector or in the dishonourable branch of the older trades which contains, on Mayhew's (1972) reckoning, ninety per cent of London artisans.

> In many occupations, especially domestic outwork like handloom weaving and again in the urban sweated trades. Leisure time was often unemployment time

---

[105] Joan Burstin, *Victorian Education And The Ideal Of Womanhood* (London: Croom Helm, 1980), 15.

[106] Morris, *Hopes and Fears for Art*. In Ball ed. , (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1931), 113.

[107] Morris, *Lecture on Art and Industry*. In Ball ed. (1931, 103-110).

[108] William Morris, *The Beauty of Life* (1880). In Briggs ed. (1962, 105).

without money. For most artisans and labourers dependent on the made-to order trade or the building trades, or transport, there were annual cycles of work which were made all the more treacherous by periodic national depression [109].

Morris raises the question of two options in British civilisation, that is, what we should need "art or dirt?". He sees the way out of 'dirt' in education[110]. This is "the remedy for the barbarism which has been bred by the hurry of civilisation and competitive commerce. To know that men lived and worked mightily before you is an incentive for you to work faithfully now, that you may leave something to those who come after you" [111] Arnold thinks that a nation can be judged by "the cultural condition of the masses" (47) For him culture "is the study of perfection, (it) leads us to conceive of true human perfection as a harmonious perfection, developing all sides of our humanity and as a general perfection, developing all parts of our society" (1869, 8). He believes that the main features a culture should 'possess' are "sweetness and light", that is, "beauty and intelligence". He goes on to say that against anarchy the only means culture can fight with is "right, reason, ideas and light" (1869, 57). Raymond Williams (1958) highlights Arnold's concept of Industry and Production and the notion of 'stock nation" which, he says, fit in with the ideas of Carlyle and Ruskin. It is also noteworthy that Arnold sees the danger of both the 'spiritual and social anarchy' entailing the power of the rising classes. He divides English society into three classes which, in his view, are

> the *Barbarians*; aristocrats who "possess inward gifts: courage, a high spirit, self-confidence and outward gifts and graces in looks, manners, accomplishments, powers" (1869, 69) "an ordinary Englishman of our upper class ideas he has not..." (57)
>
> the *Philistines*; middle- class, only they "can consider the greatness of and welfare of England by being rich" (36)

---

[109] Eileen Yeo,. "Culture and Constraints in Working-Class Movements, 1820-1855," in E.ileen and Stephen. Yeo eds.. *Popular Culture and Class Conflict 1580-1914: Exploration in the History of Labour and Leisure* (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1981), 163.

[110] His answers to the question of how education contributes to the 'empowerment of aesthetics' can be found in chapter 8.

[111] Matthew Arnold, *Culture And Anarchy*, Samuel Lipman ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1869), 47.

the *Populace*; lower- class "half developed, has long lain half-hidden amidst its poverty and squalor"(71) and "pressed constantly by the hard daily compulsion of material wants"(51).

In John Ruskin's opinion, there are classes in English society "who are ill-educated, cowardly, and more or less stupid. And with these people, just as certainly the fee is first, and the work second" (1898, 42). Carlyle expresses his contempt when analysing High Class living without duties which, he says, is like "a tree planted on precipices; from the roots of which all the earth has been crumbling" (1843, 180). He speaks of a working aristocracy such as the Mill-owners, Manufacturers, Commanders of Working men and unworking aristocracy" in relation to the question of who can be considered the idle aristocracy and his answer is: " the Owners of the Soil of England; whose recognised function is that of handsomely consuming the rents of England, shooting the partridges of England, and as an agreeable amusement (if the purchase money and other conveniences serve) dilettanteing in Parliament" (1843, 178-180). Some observations also need to be made here regarding the English middle classes. I will do this by using Routh's (1935, 142) views who approaches this question through the analysis of middle-class homes and its members' attitudes towards art and beauty. Roth says that the middle class already expanded their power to Europe by controlling trade and the direction of politics. Their homes were losing the functions of a nursery and hospital, instead, they were becoming the 'place' of preparing new generations for the increasing responsibilities of British prosperity. In the days of mass-production the middle-class 'householder' keeps buying and excludes himself from producing values. What is also worth mentioning is the fact that household architecture, furniture and decoration, in Routh's view, have become the major feature of civilisation. Robert Gray shares Routh's view observing the following "there was a significant measure of external conformity to norms of domestic life and sexual morality, religious observance, and serious application to public service as the obligation of social privilege"[112]. Morris calls a

> strange phenomenon, that there is now a class of ladies and gentlemen, very refined indeed, though not perhaps as well informed as is generally supposed, and of this refined class there are many who do really love beauty and incident-

[112] Robert Gray ,"Bourgeois Hegemony in Victorian Britain," in Bennett et al.. eds. (1981, 236).

> i.e., art [..] this great body of enthusiastic demanders are not mere poor and helpless people, ignorant fisher-peasants, half-mad monks, scatter-brained sanscullottes none of those. No, they are the ruling classes, the masters of men who can live without labour, and have abundant leisure to scheme out the fulfilment of their desires (1872, 90-91).

He also remarks, "the class of rich people doing no work, they consume great deal while they produce nothing [..] they have to be kept at the expense of those who do work.."[113]. Morris sees clearly that the pure fact of belonging to the working class means being deprived of 'individuality' "to be thrust aside by the hideous waste of commercial war"[114] no matter how gifted and talented men of the "working class culture" are (Williams 1981, 81). As John Ruskin puts it plainly " [..] there are class distinctions of high and low; of lost and won to the whole reach of man's souls and body" (1898, 29). He sees the question of belonging to a class in his work, entitled "The Pre-Raphaelitism" (1851) in these terms:

> The very removal of the massy bars which once separated one class of society from another, has rendered it tenfold more shameful in foolish people. Now that a man may make money, and rise in the world, and associate himself, unreproached, with people once far above him. [..] it becomes veritable shame to him to remain in the state he was born in, and everybody thinks it is his duty to try to be a 'gentleman'[115].

After looking at how the notions of civilisation, culture and classes in the light of work and labour are viewed by Morris and Ruskin and a few of the Victorian thinkers I have to raise the following questions which I will attempt to answer later :

- what could be the upper classes' e.g.: the aristocrats' role to "unite art and labour"? (Thorndike 1920, 115)

---

[113] Morris, "*Useful Work Versus Useless Toil,*" in Briggs ed. (1962, 119).

[114] Morris, " Political Writings Contribution to Justice and Commonweal 1883-1890". Nicholas Salamon ed. (New York: The Liberal Press, 1994), 29.

[115] Ruskin, Works, 12, 342 in Walter Houghton *The Victorian Frame Of Mind*, 1930-1870 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), 187.

- is not the idea, already in its roots, of using art and beauty as a means of educating the members of the dominant culture[116] to become more sensitive towards others' work utopian?
- can art be built into the frame of mind of the working classes[117] who are condemned to earn" [..] daily bread; they do not know of art, it does not touch their lives at all [..] the grinding trouble of those who toil to live .forbids them to look upon art as a matter of importance"? [118]

3.1.3 The "Snowball" and a "Living Parcel" Image: Victorian Culture in the Light of Work and Labour

Eileen and Stephen Yeo make the following observation regarding the question work and labour. In capitalism, work consisting of time, knowledge, skill, abilities and 'powers' is sold "to someone else to make their commodities in their time for wages with which we buy the rest of life" [119]. What Tom Nairn says about the "genesis of capitalism", that is, it resulted in "changes in the mind of people towards each other, their environment and *work"* (1964, 53) is an important line of thought to understand why Morris and Ruskin consider the analysis of these questions so important.

Following Williams' conception of the theory of culture which, in his opinion, is an attempt "to discover the nature of the organisation which is the complex of these relationships" (1981, 47) the values and meanings of work and labour as the main condition of life may help to understand their roles in a new relationship being between aesthetics, morals and ethics in an "elaborate civilisation" (Morris 1872, 82). Williams' definitions of both work and labour are worth quoting to be able to clarify the basis of their meanings.

---

[116] I apply the definition of dominant and subdominant cultures as they are used by Clarke et al.. (1981, 53-79).

[117] By the notion of working class I mean the definition of Alan Hunt (1977, 83-84).

[118] Morris, *Hopes and Fears for Art: The prospects of Architecture*, in Ball ed., 1931, 98.

[119] In Robert Gray's opinion nineteenth-century capitalism was competitive based on "family business and private partnerships, with localised basis". "Bourgeois Hegemony in Victorian Britain" in Bennettt et al. eds. (1981), 236.

Work is "[...] our most general word for doing something, and for something done. Early man did not work at all in the true sense.. real work, steady work, labour for one's livelihood, came into being when agriculture was invented. The basic sense of the work, to indicate activity and effort or achievement, has thus, been modified, though unevenly and incompletely, by a definition of its imposed conditions, such as 'steady' or timed work, or working for a wage or salary: being hired.[...]. The specialisation of work to pay employment is the result of the development of capitalist productive relations (1976, 334-135).

There is an interesting relation between *work* and *labour*. *Labour* had a strong mediaeval sense of pain and toil. In Williams view,

> *Labour* had a common sense of ploughing or working the land, but it was also extended to other kinds of manual work and to any kind of difficult effort [...]. The sense of labour as a general social activity came through more clearly, and with a more distinct sense of abstraction. [...] But the most important change was the introduction of labour as a term in political economy (1976, 334-335).

The economic meanings of work and labour also become wider in the nineteenth century. Henry George suggests that "land, labour and capital are the three factors of production"[120] and "labour includes all human exertion, and hence human powers whether natural or acquired" (1939, 21). He sees labour as the means of "further production" as well as "the employer" of capital. While analysing progress and poverty, he highlights the economic functions of labour stating that "capital is a result of labour, and is used by labour to assist it in further production. Labour is the active and initial force, and labour is therefore, the employer of capital" (1939, 115). Regarding work, Houghton (1957) emphasises the Puritan influence of the reshaping, restructuring business society. He is convinced that without work the Victorians could not have achieved their twin goals, that is, "respectability and salvation" (1957, 189). What was preached by parents, lecturers and writers was that everyone had the duty to labour for God in a way that it should reflect "novelty and precision". Gramsci[121]

---

[119] Eileen and Stephen Yeo., "Ways of Seeing: Control and Leisure versus Class and Struggle," in Eilien and Stephen Yeo eds., *Popular Culture and Class Conflict 1590-1914: Explorations in the History of Labour and Leisure.* (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1981), 146.

[120] Henry George, *Progress And Poverty* (London: The Henry George Foundation of Great Britain, 1939), 114.

approaches the notion of work by considering it a "specific mode" enabling man to change and "socialise" life so that with rights and duties especially within the framework of the state man could transform "natural order" (1988, 312). It is true that the state is always in Morris' and Ruskin's vision but, in my view, they speak,

first, of the duties and rights of individuals that they should experience in their work,

then, of a state that ought to. humanise work by the rules of aesthetics while not forgetting about God's commandments.

From the perspective of their aesthetics they view the state, as a system that tolerates and 'produces' "ill-educated, cowardly, and more or less stupid people. And, with these people, just as certainly the fee is first, and the work second" says Ruskin (1898, 42), Routh (1937) is right to claim that a state has its own duties which should reconstruct and redesign education[122] so that it will primarily serve individuals' self- and professional development. But, Routh doubts if this can be done by the civilisation which exposes its individuals to mutual dependence and deprives them of the possibility of becoming creative thinkers. Fortunately, Routh goes on to say, civilisation also brings about an influence, some interest and art that "restores a man to the consciousness of his innate self" (1937, 155). In order to be able to place their concepts of work and labour in the wider framework of civilisation and culture and the place of classes, working classes, work and labour in Morris' and Ruskin aesthetics I will discuss the main characteristic of these notions. In my view these are:

civilisation is standard of truth,

culture is art, humanism, ethics, morals derived from aesthetics, a way of life whose principles are to appreciate work of man and nature,

individuals' and groups' answers to the question of if work produces "art or dirt?" it is also the study of "human perfection". Its members are rational or emotional beings who are workers, and artists.

"the very tone of people's voice, the literature they read, the things which give them pleasure, the words which come out of their mouths" (Arnold 1969, 18).

---

[121] Gramsci, "Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935 ". David Forgacs ed. (New York: Schoken Books, 1988), 312.

[122] In chapter 8 I will discuss Morri's and Ruskin's educative concepts.

classes: "a propertised class living on the labour of a propertyless one" (Morris 1872, 75)

working classes: millions earning "daily bread", toil to live, people who are not touched by art at all. gifted and talented individuals equipped with skills and knowledge to express emotions, thoughts, in their own degree and spehere,

work and labour: toil, creation, the means of expressing beauty, happiness and thoughts as well as destruction.

As already be indicated, by looking at the meanings of the notions listed at the start both in the theoretical context of Cultural Studies and in Morris' and Ruskin' concepts generated by their aesthetics my aim is to provide a framework with clear definitions for the analysis of Morris's and Ruskin's 'empowered aesthetics' through their views of *work and labour* based on their sense of beauty and humanism. Therefore, the first thing that needs to be clarified, in the next chapter, is the set of meanings, in a broader terms, attached to aesthetics by nineteenth century philosophy and to William Morris' and John Ruskin's theories of aesthetics. I will apply, for example, Terry Eagleton's, Raymond Williams' concepts in my attempt to grasp the specific meanings of aesthetics, art and beauty which will help me trace later their relationship with other spheres such as ethics, morals and education.

Chapter 4 Inheriting "Aesthetic Experience and Harmony"

4.1. Aesthetics, Art and Beauty?

The abstract nature of the conceptions of *aesthetics* would demand a detailed overview of the development of the notion throughout the centuries. Instead I will highlight points that are relevant to the questions of this study, for example, the relationship between classes and art, whether "structural privileges" (Sinfield 1989) allow the idea of "aesthetic harmony", and "art as blessedness" (Morris 1931) to emerge. I agree with Munro that ; "each age has its own definition and philosophy that are not entirely new ones, the old conceptions are revised for present situations and uses" [According to his definition] "The field of phenomena studied by aesthetics is made up, to a large extent, of the arts and related types of experience" [123]. He goes on to say,

[123] Thomas Munro, *The Arts and Their Interrelations*. (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1949)., 3.

> it was once the fashion to construct vast, compartmental systems of the arts, with a claim to eternal rightness and completeness. The *Platonic* idealistic, believing in the independent reality of universals or general concepts, found it easy to infer that each *art* was a fixed, transcendent realm of Being. To define art, then, was to state the eternal limits of that realm; [..] *Aristotelian* logic, a definition stated the "essence" of what was defined [..] Everything had a determinate essence, and there was only one definition appropriate to it: that which expressed the essence (1949, 16).

Before examining the concepts of Morris and Ruskin derived from by their experience, knowledge and particularly their sense of beauty it is worth quoting Raymond Williams' views in relation to the meanings of *aesthetics* to see clearly what this notion covers:

> **Aesthetic** first appeared in English in C19, and was not common before mC19. It was in effect, in spite of its Greek form, a borrowing from German, after a critical and controversial development in that language. It was first used in a Latin form as the title of two volumes, *Aesthetica* (1750-8), by Alexander Baumgarten (1714-62). Baumgarten defined beauty as phenomenal perfection, and the importance of this, in thinking about art, was that it placed a predominant stress on apprehension through the *senses* [..] Baumgarten's new use was part of an emphasis on subjective sense activity, and on the specialised human creativity of art. In Kant beauty was also seen as an essentially and exclusively sensuous phenomenon, but he protested against Baumgarten's use and defined *aesthetics* in the original and broader Greek sense of the science of "the conditions of sensuous perception"[124].

Elsewhere he remarks, the idea of art "as a superior reality" in the 19th century offers an "immediate basis for an important criticism of industrialism"[125]. He explains, "Asthetica, itself a new word, and a product of the specialisations, similarly stood parent to aesthete" (1958, 44). Michel Sprinker points out that "The aesthetic is a species-specific capacity, a potential all human beings possess, even if some realise

---

[124] Raymond Williams, *Keywords. A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (London: Flamingo, 1976), 31-33. To have an insight into the development of British aesthetics it is worth consulting Walter Hamilton *The Aesthetic Movement in England.* (London: Reeves and Turner, 1882).

[125] Raymond Williams ,"Culture is ordinary," in Norman Mackenzie ed.., *Conviction.* (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1958), 43.

this potential more fully and more often than others"[126]. Henry Ladd notes that art in the Victorian period "was following a conventional road of aesthetic speculation. The popular subjects of art had been religious. Slowly, they had changed to portraiture, to classic themes, to historical allegory and, shortly before Ruskin's time, to natural landscape. Each of these changes brought some new theoretical justification" (1932, 167). George Landow (1971) believes that the crucial point of the development of aesthetical theories is that there is a gradual shift from analysing and determining beauty through its "external qualities of the object" by using emotions and psychological experiences. Curt John Ducasse[127] makes it clear that the meanings of 'aesthetic' today is ambiguous. In his view, sometimes it is used in its etymological sense of 'perceptible', or having to do with perception". He mentions, as an example, the first part of Kant's[128] work, entitled "Critiques Of Pure Reason". The other set of meanings of the term, in his opinion, covers

> less distinct sorts of inquires, such as the philosophy of art and of beauty; empirical investigations of the characters possessed by the things judged beautiful by certain persons [..]; and also art-criticism.... it is used by some as an adjective intended to differentiate feelings obtained in the contemplation of things which are meant to be *mere designs*, from feelings obtained in the contemplation of other things, such as dramatic entities (1966, 123-128).

I would also like to highlight Sienfield's (1989) concepts to understand the aesthetics of Victorian culture. Sinfield says that looking back from the aesthetic principles and concepts of our time we tend to misinterpret and misplace the art of previous centuries since art has been "mediated through our particular institutions" and "when we put aside the art of earlier generations we are not aware that the concepts have already been interwoven with our history, culture and institutions" (1989, 28). To avoid misinterpretations of art I will look briefly at Sinfield's idea of valuing art, for example, literacy through "idealistic aesthetics" which

> often strives to discern an essential quality of literatureness in admired texts, but actually a text may appear literary, or otherwise, depending on the contexts

---

[126] Michel Sprinker, *Imaginary Relations. Aesthetics and Ideology in the Theory of Historical Materialism* (London: Verso, 1987), 12.

[127] John Ducasse, *The Philosophy Of Art* (New York: Dover Publications, 1966).

[128] It is Thomas Munro who details both Kant's and Hegel's systems of the arts in his book, 1949, 173-179.

in which it is regarded. Not only does a film become an art because people move it into that discourse; the kinds of film considered artistic are developed to include popular Hollywood genres" (1989, 29).

The 'danger' also lies in the way, he proceeds, as art is developed in our culture. Soon it can be considered less the property of texts than a way of reading and placing these texts in our culture. In other words, when attempting to follow a specific process within the aesthetic trend of an age we should work 'carefully' with theories of our time to be able uncover the concepts and principles of the specific art of an age. Naturally Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics cannot be compared to the influence and effect of Hollywood films, but by using this example I intend to emphasise that misunderstood and misinterpreted aesthetic concepts will hinder our understanding of the arts of earlier generations or even the aesthetic value of a piece of work of the present time. It is also worth emphasising that Sinfield conceives art from the viewpoint of "welfare-capitalists"[129] who recycle the values and taste of their culture so that they will be able to practice power over other 'cultures'. By noting this and that that "the phenomena labelled 'art' are only a tiny part of anyone's cultural experience, compared with work and family relations and the media" he arrives at seeing 'art' as the means of "ultimate insult and deprivation" of the dominant culture whose members "are likely to believe their own ideology whereas others have a better idea of how the world actually works" (1989, 57). I will keep this view in mind when analysing Morris' and Ruskin's way of seeing the ethical and moral aspects of the work and labour of "dominant culture". Sinfield (1989, 55) has another exciting perception, that is, art just like other 'goods' in a wellfare society, is presented for everybody and offered for sale. This emphasises availability in which "structural privileges" are preserved. My view of this aspect of art is that power presents itself straightforwardly and the question here is not the quality of work and labour in terms of producing art and beauty so that everyone will have the chance to experience perfection and happiness, but making things and quality which will make people spend money. This quality[130] regarded work and labour cannot be fitted into Morris' and Ruskin's theories since it 'invites' money and it is in contrast to their ethical, moral and educative views.

---

[129] Sinfield formulates this concept on the basis of analysing the notion of 'high culture'. See the meaning of "high culture" on the next page.

[130] Quality is a central point of their aesthetics. They believe that if work lacks quality then it is worthless.

Sinfield draws attention to the fact that the middle-class benefits from subsidies to culture both as producers and as consumers. In his opinion, " Middle-class culture is organised, by and large, from within the ethos of that class, whereas 'lower-class culture' in the market, is often organised by entrepreneurs with allegiances elsewhere." (55). He thinks, that the "twist" is that when "lower class people" refuse art this is considered to be their own fault. Thus, the idea of 'high-culture'[131] becomes the "self-justification of the upper-classes" and the means of hegemonic culture. John Fiske emphasises the impact of our way of living and experiences on formulating meanings of art. He thinks that it is

> not the aesthetic ideals of form and beauty found in great art, [..] not the aesthetic products of the human spirit acting as a bulkwork against that tide of grubby industrial materialism and vulgarity, but rather a way of living within an industrial society that encompasses all the meanings of the social experience (1996, 115).

This line of thought reinforces Morris' (1872) views of the role of art discussed below. He is convinced that what masses of people experience in their environment will determine their attitudes toward others and even, for example, how they want to spend their leisure time.

Following Curt John Ducasse's view that "there is no one firmly established sense in which the word Aesthetic is used" (1966, 123), I will explicitly state which qualities of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics may identify the specificity of their philosophy in terms of work and labour. I will do this by offering the theoretical diversity and fuller meanings of their ideas of beauty and art:

> firstly, by discussing some of the prevailing concepts of the nineteenth century
> secondly, by exploring principles and qualities of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics from which I will set out an analysis of their educative and ethical concepts through work and labour.

[131] By his definition 'high culture'' is the "culture of leisure class" But, he remarks, it is not simply 'bourgeois or capitalist'. Since. the factory system and urbanisation helped to provoke the Romantic movement, the middle-class has thrown up a dissident fraction hostile to the hegemony of that class. " He also writes that the "dissident middle-class intellectuals whose line [..]-is continuous with the present , runs through the aesthetic movement, Fabianism, Modernism, Bloomsbury, [..] Leavisism, [..] they may attempt an alliance with the working class or other opposed groups.." (1989, 41).

4.1.2 Art and Beauty: Are They "Accident or Blessedness"? [132]

To establish the meaning of art, beauty and beautiful within William Morris's and John Ruskin's aesthetics in order to understand the process which makes *art and beauty* responsive to *work and labour* to such an extent that it 'empowers' aesthetics. I will discuss Morris's and Ruskin's views of beauty and art employing different meanings from the ones which have already been worked out and practised by "dominant culture" (Clarke et al. 1981), and their roles in equipping man, in his own degree and sphere, with abilities, skills and knowledge to change.[133] Without intending to work with one simple definition let me quote Arthur Danto's comments on Picasso's views of art to raise awareness of the essence of art

> Picasso once pasted the label from a bottle of Suze onto a drawing of a bottle, implying that there was little point in approximating to a reality by arduous academic exercise when we could just coopt fragments of reality and incorporate them in our works, immediately achieving what the best academic hand could only aspire to." The question arises here, says Danto: "Who needs, and what can be the point and purpose of having, duplicates of a reality we already have before us? Who needs detached images of the sun, the stars, and the rest, when we can see these things already, and since nothing appears in the mirrors which is not already there in the world to be seen without it? (1981, 8-9)

According to Forbes Watson, the editor of "The Arts", it cannot be proved "that a piece of work is a work of art, what we can prove is that it is a work of art to someone"[134]. As, Danto warns us, we should remember the fact that "one's aesthetics responses are often a function of what one's beliefs about an object are" (1981, 98-99). The 18th century considers beauty as order. Hume sees the 'place' of beauty among other emotions as well as in the light of someone else's power. He remarks,

> The virtue, knowledge, wit, good sense, good humour of any person, produce love and esteem; and the opposite qualities, hatred and contempt. The same

---

[132] Morris, *Hopes and Fears For Art. The Beauty of Life*, in Ball ed. (1931, 84)

[133] See for more details in chapter 8, section 8.1.

[134] Quoted in Thomas Munro (1949, 20).

passions arise from bodily accomplishments, such as beauty, force, swiftness, dexterity; A prince, that possessed of a stately place commands the esteem of the people upon that account; and that *first,* by the beauty of the palace, *secondly,* by the relation of property, which connects it with him. The removal of either of these destroys the passion; which evidently proves that the cause is a compounded one"[135].

He also relates, for example, personal beauty to "an air of vigour and health", "strength and activity" (413). Edmund Burke's ideas of the "Sublime and Beautiful"[136] are the most influential "aesthetic speculations" in the eighteenth-century, says Walter J. Hipple,[137]. The essence of his inquiry regarding these notions is "The passion caused by the great and *sublime* in nature, [....] is Astonishment; and astonishment is that state of the soul, in which all its motions are suspended, with some degree of horror"[138]. By *beauty* he means,

> that quality or those qualities in bodies by which they cause *love*, or some passion similar to it. I confine this definition to the merely sensible qualities of things, for the sake of preserving the utmost simplicity in a subject which must always distract us, whenever we take in those various causes of sympathy...I likewise distinguish love, by which I mean the satisfaction which arises the mind, that hurries us on to the possession of certain objects, that not affect us as they are beautiful, but by means altogether different" (1990, 83).

He also remarks, "beauty should be smooth, and polished beauty should not be obscure, beauty should be light and delicate"(1990, 113). In relation to these opinions Terry Eagleton observes,

> The essay on the beautiful and sublime is a subtle phenomenology of the senses, a mapping of the body's delicacies and disgusts [...]. He is much

---

[135] David Hume, *A Treatise Of Human Nature* (London: Penguin, 1739), 380.

[136] George Landow sees these notions applied in English aesthetics as follows: In his opinion sublimity is not a specific term,-"not a term descriptive of the effect of a particular class of ideas. Anything which elevates the mind in sublime. Sublmity is, therefore, only another word for the effect of greatness upon feeling. The sublime is not distinct from what is beautiful, nor from other sources of pleasure in art, but only a particular mode and manifestation of them" (1971, 138). The development of sublimity was affected by the psychological speculations of Hobbes, Locke and Hume.

[137] Walter J. Hipple, *The Beautiful, The Sublime, And The Picturesque In Eighteenth-Century. British Aesthetic Theory* (The Southern Illinois University Press: Cabondle, 1957), 83.

> preoccupied with sweet smells and violent startings from sleep, with the vibratory power of salt and the question whether proportion is the source of beauty in vegetable. All of this strange homespun psycho-physiology is a kind of politics, willing to credit no theoretical notion which cannot somehow be traced to the muscular structure of the eye or the texture of the fingerpads. (1990, 57).

Landow mentions that Reynolds in his book entitled, The Idler "attaches great importance to the influence of *custom* upon the beautiful" (1971, 93).

The *romanticist*[139], writes Thomas Munro, "prefers to think of art as a process of creating and experiencing, rather than of the finished work of art as a static form" he "revels in the uniqueness and constant change of all phenomena, including works of art."(1949, 16). Ruskin's words, quoted below, also show one of the most characteristic qualities of romanticism, that is, the notion of ideal: He thinks, "The work of art which represents, not a material object, but the mental conception of a material object, is, in the main sense of the word ideal"[140]. Eagleton (1983) considers the Romantic period the one in which the modern sense of *art*, namely *literature*, in general, and *poetry*, in its specificity, have been formed and new meanings attached to them. In his opinion, it is also the period in which we can see the rise of modern 'aesthetics', or the philosophy of art. He writes, "It is mainly from this era, in the work of Kant, Hegel[141] Schiller[142], Coleridge and others, that we inherit our contemporary

---

[138] Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful.* Adam Philips ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990). *53.* First published in 1757.

[139] I will look at the concept of art and roles of an artist as a Poet in the Romantic period in section 4.1.5.

[140] John Ruskin, *Modern Painters* vol. 2. chp. 13. (Kent: George Allen, 1888), 9

[141] E.F. Carritt, *The Theory of Beauty* (London:: Metguen, 1914) chap. 6 details Hegel's concepts.

[142] Schiller stresses the impact of knowledge on art and concludes in his work entitled, *On the Aesthetic: Education of Man* Elisabeth M. Wilkinson and L.A. Willoughby eds. , (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967) "Art, like Science, is absolved from all positive constraints and from all conventions introduced by man; both rejoice in absolute *immunity* from human arbitrariness. The political legislator may put their territory out of bounds; he cannot rule within it. [...] Truth itself will prevail. He can humiliate the artists; but Art cannot falsify." (67). His answer of what man is like before knowing beauty and the delight in things transmitted by beauty makes his view of the power of aesthetic explicit: "A monotonous, self-seeking yet without a Self, lawless, yet without Freedom, a slave, yet to no Rule. [...] the world is for him merely Fate, not yet object; nothing exists for him expect what furthers his own existence" (56).

ideas of the "symbol" and "aesthetic experience" of "aesthetic harmony and the unique nature of artecraft" (1983, 20-21).

As the concepts of Cultural Studies have demonstrated commitment to the analysis of art and beauty within culture, therefore it is worth looking at Inglis' (1993, 175-201) opinion who attempts to summarise theories around the relationship between hegemony, power (military, legal or economic), art and culture by raising the following questions: "We study the news of the world and the delightful vanity of human wishes in order to confront political horror? What about the promise of happiness held out by art? What about art itself ?" (181). He goes on to say that "the invention of aesthetics as a special zone of academic and educational significance [....] turned into the saving graces of personal redemption and exclusiveness" (182). It is culture which starts working and functioning as politics. Thus, Inglis thinks, the study of culture is the study of power-relations. But, he also emphasises *that making and creating* go beyond the realms of power (187). In a process whose outcome is art and value the notion of money changes. *Money* here cannot express the *"timeless" value* of art. It is true that as soon as art becomes the status of wealth a social group arises which "justified its existence and selected its memberships in virtue of its powers of aesthetic discrimination" (188). What follows from this theory is that the values of art is decided by the ruling classes[143]. He argues that

> Power speaks through the status of art; the very category of art serves to declare and embody that power. To deny the status is to oppose the power. To discover and affirm value is in itself to empower (190)

When analysing the meanings of art Inglis finds it crucial to examine also what is meant by *achievement, education* (its power) *aesthetics as ideology* and *style*[144] as well as the relationship between *style and artists.* Although education is the means of 'reproducing' power it can also mean that generations are tauught what and how to look at and listen to. He highlights an important idea of Cultural Studies, that is, "those who want to speak up for *freedom* from oppression need art in order to describe what such freedom may look like" (194). This idea is important in the analyses of Morris' and Ruskin's *"empowered aesthetics"* within which I will try to examine

---

[143] Inglis (189) also talks about selection whose most visible process is the selection of the art-storekeepers.

[144] At this point he mainly thinks of Derida's theory of "the metaphysics presence" (196).

- to what extent their aesthetics (both its theories and practices) differs from the one maintained by the hegemony and power of the ruling classes and
- whether the set of meanings of their art and beauty offer new aspects of creation and happiness through work and labour for all classes.

Now I will turn to look at Morris's and Ruskin's aesthetics, but let me begin with one of Ruskin's line of thoughts regarding art and work.

> the history and poetry of nations is to be accumulative, just as science and history are; the work of living men not [...] the work of the past. Nearly every great and intellectual race of the world has produced, at every period of its career, an art with some peculiar and precious character about it, wholly unattainable by any other race, and at any other time; and the intention of Providence concerning that art, is evidently that it should all grow together into one mighty temple; the rough stones and the smooth all finding their place, and rising, day by day, in richer and higher pinnacles to heaven (1907, 72-73).

A brief answer to the question raised in the title of this section is, yes, "Art is blessing", (Morris 1872, 84) it is the essence of life and man's earthly mission to use his courage (in building pyramids, cathedrals, bridges etc.), talent, knowledge and the power of his mind to create, make life bearable, perhaps more beautiful for himself and others, and to accept, not to destroy the beauties of Nature. It is through experiencing art and beauty that we can develop our and others understanding of the world as well as making sense of ourselves. Art teaches us how it is worth living and what our *work and labour* should express and serve so that our morals and ethics will be worthy for the gift God has given us, that is, his intellect[145] and capacity for creation. In a narrower sense of the "great body" of *art* Morris [146] lists *Architecture, Sculpture, and Painting* and considers these components "master-arts", the ones representing the intellect. He examines and 'works'[147] with art both as an artist and a craftsman. In both roles art or creation is a physical, emotional and intellectual exercise supporting man to express his 'soul and mind' making them visible and touchable for others. Morris' arguments are mostly

---

[145] It is worth mentioning here Schiller's thoughts regarding the relationship between *intellect and beauty* He says, ,"who take intellect as their exclusive guide, can never arrive at any concept of beauty, because in the totality which constitutes it they can discern nothing else but the parts so that spirit and matter remain for them eternally distinct" (1967 Letter Eighteenth).

[146] Morris, *Hopes and Fears for Art,* in Ball ed. (1931, 138).

[147] I am using the opinions of E.P. Thompson (1955 , 655-667).

based on the theory of Decorative art (see details below) particularly where admitted to the realm of intellect. Viewing the Renaissance[148] as the beginning of architectural art determines the characteristics of his theories as well as Ruskin's.-.

Another focus of Morris' and Ruskin's concepts is the questions of how art could be built into the life of the working classes. Here it is worth remembering what Sinfield (1989) says about the "twist" of lower class people's neglecting art. Since art evokes happiness, love, truth, ideal, sympathy, pleasure, perfection and defines the role of artists and workers the members of the ever-increasing working classes should be both provided opportunities to experience beauty by their work and be taught how to produce it. Saying this I also think that artists are aware of the multitude of factors involved in their responsibilities in terms of "aesthetic harmony" (Eagleton 1983). Morris thinks, it is not a 'vain dream', to have art as it existed in times when "there was less courage, kindness and truth in the world than there is now [...]. The art we are striving for is a good thing "which all can share, which will elevate all. [...] such an art there will be here after, then there will be more courage, kindness, and truth than is now in the world" says Morris [149]. A crucial point of Morris' philosophy is that he cannot imagine art functioning as an 'island', just for the sake of producing something beautiful. He suggests, "art is and must be, either in its abundance or its barrenness, in its sincerity or its hollowness, the expression of the society amongst which it exists" (1872, 84). The same idea is also represented by two of Ruskin's principles namely that:

> first principle: art shall sensitively reveal the story of life;
>
> second principle: man the chief source of the manifestation of the Deity, shall be seen in a realistic relationship to the other parts of the universe, and to the various sides of his own nature (Ladd 1932, 240).

The other central questions of Morris' and Ruskin's art, in my opinion, are how *work and labour* relate to art and beauty and to what extent they affect each other through which, besides personal inspirations, ethics and morality also occur. Morris claims, "real art is the expression by man of his pleasure in labour. I do not believe he can be happy in labour without expressing that happiness. [...] What matter if his happiness

---

[148] Ruskinian aesthetics "profoundly abhors the geometric regulations of the Renaissance and feels sympathy for the naturalism of Gothic" (. Rosenberg, 1963, 72). Rosenberg writes that for Ruskin "Renaissance divorced itself from nature. (she) appeared to be less a process of growth than a fixed condition of being, a great cosmological chain precisely proportioned in all its parts." (1963, 78-79).

[149] William Morris, *The Art of the People,* in Ball ed. (1931, 114.)

lies with what must be always with him-his work?"[150]. In my view, Ruskin's concepts of "Typical and Vital" Beauty[151] are the core of how he sees ethics and morals attached to the realm. of art and the way they complement and influence each other. Often, the outcome of this relationship is a process making the ideas interchangeable. I will touch upon only the features of *Typical and Vital beauty* which I have considered relevant to Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics within the question of *work and labour* in relation to social, ethical and moral doctrines. By the term "beauty Ruskin means two things,

> first, " that external quality of bodies already so often spoken of, and which, whether it occurs in a stone, flower, beast, or in a man, is absolutely identical,[..].may be shown to be in some sort typical of the Divine attributes, and which therefore I shall call, [..] *Typical Beauty*; and secondarily, the appearance of felicitous fulfilment of function in living things, more especially of the joyful and right exertion of perfect life in man; and this kind of beauty I shall call *Vital Beauty*[152].

The modes of *Typical Beauty* are *infinity, unity, repose, symmetry, purity and moderation*. About Infinity he says, it "is of all visible things the least material, the least finite, the farthest withdrawn from the earth prison-house, the most typical of the nature of God" (1888, 39). The two components of Infinity are: "human light and objects' light". Love of change as a principle of human nature is another question of Typical Beauty. In Ruskin's opinion variety arising out of unity is harmonious and secures as well as extends unity; "the greater the number of objects which by their differences become members of one another, the more extended the sublime of their unity"[153] is. To the question of whether beautiful is useful Ruskin's answer shows how clearly he sees and understands human nature, "It is to confound admiration with hunger, love with lust and life with sensation; it is to assert that the human creature has no ideas and no feelings except those ultimately referable to its brutal appetites"[154]. He doubts that a single traveller "will be willing to pay an increased fare on the South

---

[150] Morris, *The Art of the People*, in Ball ed. (1931, 117).

[151] A thorough analysis of these notions is offered in Landow (1971, 114- 157).

[152] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol 2. chp. 3.(1888, 27).

[153] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 2. (1888, 51)

[154] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 2. chp. 4.(1888, 29)

Western railway, because the colours of the terminus are covered with patterns from Niniveth" (1849, 122).

It is worth examining Ruskin's theory of art and beauty in relation to a subject such as "drapery" to uncover the subtle 'layers' of his theory. He writes that drapery has two functions: "they are the exponents of motion and of gravitation". "These are the most valuable means of expressing past as well as present motion in the figure, and they are almost the only means of indicating to the eye the force of gravity which resists such motion" (1849, 113). Reflecting on art, its functions, structures and new roles as well as its contents it is, for Morris and Ruskin, not just a passion felt for creations of both Man and Nature but also an attempt to answer serious social, cultural and economic questions through art. It also follows from their concepts that their aesthetics incorporates their principles into the realm of *criticism*. In relation to their criticism I highlight an aspect which in Morris' and Ruskin's opinion is one of the most painful 'black spots' of the British way of handling and appreciating art. As Ruskin writes,

> the very fact that we despise the great art of the past shows that we cannot produce great art now. If we could do it, we should love it when we saw it done- if we really cared for it, we should recognise it and keep it: but we don't care for it. It is not art that we want: it is amusement, gratification of pride, present gain- anything in the world but art (1907, 90).

For both Morris and Ruskin beauty embodies God's[155] power through man's soul, generates emotions and thoughts as well as supports to understand other nation's and people's intellects and feelings, unites and harmonises the 'work' of brain and hand in a way that may affect man's view of his work and role in the world. In my view, where their concepts of beauty meet can be summarised in the following points. Beauty of nature should be shown by the power of the intellect through work and learn from it, even from its 'deformed parts ", as Ruskin writes,

> Ideas of beauty are purified and exalted by the human mind. In Nature there are not only beautiful objects and things, there are 'deformed parts'. We need deformed things as beautiful cannot be considered beautiful in a pure

[155] Chapter 6 will examine the meanings of God's power within Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics.

undiseased culture [...] controls and oppositions of deformation are needed to have ideas of beauty"[156].

The power[157] of intellect combined with a sense of beauty along with the beauty of "deformed parts" enables man to perceive and express beauty. Work enables man to experience beauty either by creation or learning through others' work, as well as to harmonise usefulness with affection and delights which may counterbalance man's "imperfect work" [158](Ruskin 1886).

To gain a deeper insight into Morris's and Ruskin's complex, sometimes contradictory concepts of art and beauty and world-views.[159] I offer a list of their aims as follows

- to make life cheerful and honourable for others and for ourselves and to give pleasure to the eyes and rest for the mind [160]
- to offer a means for helping man not "to live his poor thin life among a few exceptional men, despising those beneath them for an ignorance for which they themselves are responsible" (104).
- to give "leisure to think about our work: the faithful daily companion" (104)
- to perceive excellence and 'beautiful' for which the most cultivated taste" is needed[161]
- to bring about moral feelings that are "interwoven with our intellectual powers[162]
- to fulfil the purpose "which Nature meant to solace all, from the first dawn of history till quite modern times"[163]

---

[156] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. chp. 6.(1888, 27)

[157] The meaning of power here is the knowledge, talent and the ability to think enabling man to work.

[158] Ruskin *The Stones of Venice* (1886).

[159] By using world-views instead of aesthetics here I would like to indicate that their principles and thoughts brought about by aesthetics also embrace other realms, that is, ethics, and education, economics and politics

[160] Morris *The Lesser Arts*, in Briggs ed. (1962, 103).

[161] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 2. chp. 3. (1888, 14).

[162] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. chp. 3. (1888, 26)

- to make man's aware of the depth of thoughts, fancy, courage, affections and delights reflected in the art of architecture and "the powers of his work" enabling him to express himself in, for example, bridges and cathedrals etc (Ruskin 1886, 37-42)
- to refuse art which "would be in a way stable, would perhaps stand still also. This would be an art cultivated professedly by a few, and for a few, who would consider it necessary-a duty, if they could admit duties- to despise the common herd, to hold themselves aloof from all that" [164].

Morris connects the aims of art with "the aspects of the art [which] will at least be life. It may lead us into new splendours and beauties of visible art; to architecture with manifolded magnificence free from the curious incompleteness and failings of that which the older times have produced (1872, 9).

What follows now in terms of theories of art and beauty is my reflections on Morris' concepts of 'decorative and popular art'. The reason for dealing with the ideas of these two notions out of so many of his views is to show how Morris' pragmatism advanced far towards a system which enabled him to implement his theory in practice while conceptualising about aesthetics pushed him toward ethics and education as well as politics and economics.

4.1.3 Decorative and useful arts: "powers of mind" and "the powers of eye and hand"[165]

In Morris's opinion decorative arts involve drawing, designing and creating forms on the basis of Nature's laws. He goes on to explain that "the chief uses of decoration, the chief part of its alliance with Nature, [is] that it has to sharpen our dulled senses. [ ] the hand of the craftsman is guided to work in the way that she does, till the web, the cup, or the knife, look as natural, may be as lovely as the green field, the river[166]. Morris stresses that decorations of buildings as well as "the ornament[167] of a cloth, the

---

[163] Morris, *Hopes and Fears for Art: The Beauty of Life*, in Ball ed. (1931, 82).

[164] Morris, *Hopes and Fears for Art: The Art of people, in* Ball ed. (1931, 113).

[165] Morris, *The Lesser Arts, in* Briggs ed. (81962, 100).

[166] Morris, *The Lesser Arts, in* Ball ed. (1931, 139).

form of an ordinary vessel and a piece of furniture save the thoughts of nations we hardly know anything and calls out attention to history of past times"[168] By these he also means arts which

> all peoples and times have used; they have been the joy of free nations, and the solace of oppressed nations; religion has used and elevated them.....they are connected with all history, and are clear teachers of it, and best of all they are the sweetness of human labour, both to the handicraftsman, whose life is spent in working in them, and to people in general who are influenced by the sight of them at every turn of the day's work. [169]

The notion of decorative art, in Morris's view, also involves decoration in general whose function in man's life is to develop his taste while excluding the vulgarity and hideousness of reality from homes. Becoming aware of the rules of decorative art such as "simplicity of taste" and "love for sweet and lofty things" will help new generations to bring about a new and better art. This will be the art of all classes', an art that offers opportunities for people "who do not live long enough to do a thing themselves, and have the manliness and foresight enough to begin work, and pass it on to those that shall come after them"[170] to change as we cannot expect man who "makes the world hideous" to care about art. Ruskin thinks that "decorative art" in the form, for example, of a fountain may deeply affect man. He writes,

> there is no subject of street ornament so wise chosen as fountain, where it is a fountain in use; for it is just there that perhaps the happiest pause takes place in the labour of the day, when the pitcher is rested on the edge of it, and the breath of the bearer is drawn deeply, and the hair swept from the forehead, and the uprightness of the form declined against the marble ledge, and the sound of the kind word or light laugh mixes with the tickle of the falling water. What pause is so sweet as that-so full of the depth of ancient days, so softened with the calm of pastoral solitude? (1849, 123-124).

---

[167] Ornament, in Ruskin's view, "has two entirely distinct sources of agreeableness: one, hat of the abstract beauty of its forms, which, for the present, we will suppose to be the same whether they come from the hand or the machine; the other, the sense of human labour and care spent upon it" (The Seven Lamps Architecture. The Lamp of *The Lamp Of Truth* London: George Allen, 1849), 53.

[168] Morris, *The Lesser Arts*., in Briggs ed. (1962, 87).

[169] Morris, *The Lesser Arts*, in Briggs ed. (1962, 88).

[170] Morris, *The Lesser Arts*, in Briggs ed. (1962, 102).

Morris connects usefulness with art stating that "nothing can be a work of art which is not useful.[..] which does not minister to the body when under the command of the mind in a health state"(1962, 102). At this point we must remind ourselves that 'useful art', as Thomas Munro puts it, "has long been employed as synonymous with industrial arts" (1949, 125) and the word "industries does not always imply 'mechanical', but it does support mass production" (126). He also says, "for a while after the industrial revolution, and through much of the nineteenth-century, large-scale machine methods were mostly made by hand, as before. Hence it was supposed that only handmade things could really be art" (127). Morris's views of machinary often highlight its negative impact on thinking, creation, and the harmony between man and nature. It is true, he says, machines

> grind [man's] corn .and leave him free to smoke his pipe and think, or to carve the handle of his knife.[....].Perhaps a perfectly reasonable and free man would stop there in his dealings with machinery [...] He has to weave plain cloth, and finds doing so dullish on the one hand, and on the other that a power-loom will weave the cloth nearly as well a hand-loom. [...]. But so doing, as far as the art is concerned, he has not got a pure gain; he has made a bargain between art and labour, and got a makeshift as a consequence"[171].

To advance in our understanding of the concept of decoration in Morris's and also in Ruskin"s art in relation to work it is worthwhile to sum up their theories briefly. Decoration is not simply a way of making man's environment more beautiful and bearable among the 'dryness' and drabness produced by man's work it embodies the harmony between man's mind and hands making it possible to copy and synthesise the 'decorative art' of nature and work in harmony with her beauty. This beauty functions in man's life at two levels: it raises Nature above machines and fills "usefulness" with new meanings such as beauty by menas of work. The imperfectness[172] of man's work is

---

[171] Morris, *Signs of Change: The Aims of Art, in* Ball ed. (1931, 121).

[172] In Morris' and Ruskin's view Nature represents perfection and this can be transmitted into man's life by his work which embodies his talent, knowledge, intellect, skills and thinking. The notion of imperfect work embodies two crucial meanings:

1. Man's work in the light of God's perfect work
2 "spots" of Nature and imperfect man's work as the means of comparison; without imperfection man would not be able to appreciate perfection and to learn its criteria and work accordingly. Ruskin considers imperfect work the way toward perfection as "no great man (artist) ever stops working till he has reached his point of failure., his mind is always far in advance of his powers of execution" (Ruskin, *The Stones Of Venice,* in Evans ed. 1959, 238).

counterbalanced by the delights and happiness felt over the ability to create and the beauty transplanted 'into usefulness".

4.1.4 Popular Art

Shiach refuses attitudes toward popular art which fail to relate "cultural production" with "social power and political democracy". He explains that "From the late 16th century, we find 'popular' applied to cultural texts: to music, the press, art, science and fiction. These uses depend partially on the relationship between popular consciousness and national identity" (1989, 33), and stress the gender biased feature of 'popular'. Shiach claims that 'popular' "emerges as a legal or political term at a period when most women had few legal and political rights. The absence of women from the accounts are obvious" (1989, 9). He suggests that the question of "popular" does not only belong to the realms of culture and aesthetics, but that it is also addressed within various ranges of political and legal discourses. Before proceeding with Morris's views and perceptions concerning the question of "popular art" it will be necessary to look briefly at the changing in its meanings: In doing so, I will offer Shiach's thoughts here.

> The earliest cited use of popular, meaning generally accessible, is from 1573. [...] the term begins to be applied specifically to certain forms of literature and to ephemeral publications generally in the early 18th century. In 1835, James Stuart Mill refers to the "popular press" (1989:19-32). [...] By the mid 19th century, we find the term increasingly applied to aspects of cultural form which appeal to, or are favoured by, people generally. (There are texts in which) popular culture is the expression of the spirit of a nation or a people. These are the terms which are developed in analyses of the poetry of Ossian, of folk music, or of forms of pottery. [...] Basically , 'the popular' has always been 'the other'. The use of the term seems to imply a certain distance, a position from which 'the popular' can be evaluated, analysed and dismissed. (19-32).

Naturally, the meanings "popular" has for us now are not the same as for Morris. If politics and economics occur in his concepts they are evoked by his views of art and beauty. Therefore, my main concern here is to attempt to understand Morris' views of "popular" in relation to art and beauty. From this it follows that the word is not restricted to any particular class, it involves everyone with his sense of beauty, talent,

creativity and knowledge. Although, it is true that Morris mentions the working classes the most, he often does it to highlight the unjust nature of their work, labour and toil. He characterises popular art, which is the foundation of all arts, with two adjectives: "decorative and noble"[173]. He believes in making the "streets as beautiful as the woods, as elevating as the mountain-sides " by popular art. His starting point in the argument is that popular and decorative arts presuppose each other; they should be present and practised in all cultures, since Nature is their infinite source (materials, ideas, forms, colours etc.) and it is man's work which makes them visible and possible to use. In Morris' 'reading' popular and decorative are not related to cheap and vulgar. On the contrary, they represent beauty transferred from Nature into our daily life by work, and this work contributes to make beauty and art available for everyone. Morris says that "popular art, that is, the art which is made by the co-operation of many minds and hands varying in kind and degree of talent, but all doing their part in due subordination to a great whole, without any one losing his individuality- the loss of such art is surely great" (104). The condition of popular art, in Morris's opinion, is "that popular art cannot live if labour is to be for ever in the thrall of muddle, dishonesty, and disunion" (1962, 106). He fears losing "popular art" commenting that

> While [it] lasted, everything that was made by man was adorned by man. [.]. The craftsman, as he fashioned the thing he had under his hand, ornamented it so naturally and so entirely without conscious effort, that it is often difficult to distinguish where the mere utilitarian part of his work ended and the ornamental began the origin of this art was the necessity that the workman felt for variety in his work. [.]. All he has now quite disappeared from the work of civilisation. If you wish to have ornament, you must pay specially for it, and the workman is compelled to produce ornament...he is compelled to pretend happiness in his work, so that the beauty produced by man's hand, which was once a solace to his labour, has now become an extra burden to him and ornament is now but the follies of useless toil," (1931, 132-133).

[173] Morris, *The Lesser Arts*, in Briggs ed. (1964, 104).

4.1. 5 Concepts and Qualities of Forming an Artist

Bearing Eagleton's opinion in mind that 'to understand something is to grasp its proportioned place in the whole "[174] we must briefly descend into detail of what sets of meanings the notion of *romantic artist* conveys and how these meanings correlate with Morris's and Ruskin's conceptions of *artist* and his roles in 'aestheticising' life in relation primarily to *work and labour.*

Jerome H. Buckley speaks about the romantic artist as a 'moral' personality "For however irregular were his habits, however unconventional his attitudes, the artist as 'maker' had to be in full possession of his faculties, in absolute control of his materials. At the moment of creation he had to be an integrated person, a whole man, balanced in his emotions, right in his perceptions"[175]. By analysing the importance of literature and the changing role of Romantic Artists, especially that of writers, Eagleton suggests that both *art and artist* become 'commodities' and specifically with regard to the artist "all his rhetorical claim to be 'respective' of humankind, to speak with the voice of the people and utter eternal verities, he existed more and more on the margins of a society which was not inclined to pay high wages to prophets" (1983, 20). Raymond Williams' writes that the ruling idea of the romantic movement is that

> the Poet, the Artist is by nature indifferent to the crude worldliness and materialism of politics and social affairs; he is devoted , rather, to the more substantial spheres of natural beauty and personal feeling. [.] a conclusion about personal feeling became a conclusion about society, and an observation of natural beauty carried a necessary moral reference to the whole and unified life of man" (1958, 30).

He observes", a system of thinking about the arts also grew up " (36) and the emphasis of this system is on "the special nature of art-activity as a means to 'imaginative truth' and the artists as a special kind of man". It is his "business to read the open secret of the universe" (39). It is worth quoting what Schiller says, "The artist is indeed the child of his age". Being aware of reality and man's weaknesses his answer as to how the artist can protect himself against the corruption of the age is,

---

[174] Terry Eagleton, "Aesthetics And Politics," New Left Review, no. 107 (January/February) (1975), 35.

[175] Jerome H. Buckley, *The Victorian Temper* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1951), 153.

let him direct his gaze upwards, to the dignity of his calling and the universal Law, not downwards towards Fortune and the needs of daily life. Free alike from the futile busyness which would fain set its mark upon the fleeting moment, and from the impatient spirit of enthusiasm which applies the measure of the Absolute to the sorry products of Time let him leave the sphere of the actual to the intellect, which is at home there, whilst he strives to produce the Ideal out of the union of what is possible with what is necessary" (1967, 55-59).

When analysing the work and role of a poet Wordsworth [176] writes,:

> he is a man speaking to men; a man, it is true, endured with more lively sensibility, more enthusiasm and tenderness, who has a greater knowledge of human nature, and a more comprehensive soul, than are supposed to be common among mankind; a man pleased with his own passions and volitions, and who rejoices more than other men in the spirit of life that is in him; delighting to contemplate similar volitions and passions as manifested in the goings-on the Universe, and habitually impelled to create them where he does not find them (1984, 603).

Shelley poses the same question saying that: "Poets are. the mirrors of the gigantic shadows, which futurity casts upon the present; the words which express what they understand not; the trumpets which sing to battle, and feel not what they inspire; the influence which is moved not, but moves. Poets are the acknowledged legislators of the world"[177]. Before moving to the next phase of this chapter which is Morris's and Ruskin's concepts of the artist I will look at what Williams says about the changes in the nineteenth century in terms of art and artist. Although he emphasises the relationship between the reader and the writer, in my view, the following categories refer as much to the artists working in other fields such as painting, architecture etc. as to the writers of the age. The stages of the changes are:

> first; a major change [..] in the nature of the relationship between the writer and his readers;
>
> second; ..a different habitual attitude towards the 'public"

---

[176] William Wordsworth, *Preface to Lyrical Ballads*, in Stephen Gill ed. The Oxfords Authors. William Wordsworth. (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

[177] Percy Bysshe Shelley, *A Defence of Poetry*, in Kenneth Neil Cameron ed. *Percy Bysshe Shelley. Selected Poetry and Prose* (London: Rinehart, 1951), 490.

third, the production of art was coming to be regarded as one of the number of specialised kinds of production, subject to much the same conditions as general production,

fourth; a theory of the 'superior reality' of art, as the seat of imaginative truth, was receiving increasing emphasis;

fifth,. [...] the idea of the independent creative writer, the autonomous genius, was becoming a kind of rule. (1958, 32).

The artists of the age can experience a new freedom of thoughts manifesting itself while "a conclusion about personal feeling became a conclusion about society, and an observation of natural beauty carries a necessary moral reference to the whole and unified life of man" (30). In his opinion the roles and duties of an artisan and a craftsman are not interchangeable any longer. The emphasis is on sensibility and skill characterising craft not art. He points out, "Artists, from the general sense of skilled person, in either the 'liberal' or the 'useful' arts, had become specialised in the same direction, and had distinguished itself from *artisan* (formally equivalent with artist, but later becoming what we call, in the opposite specialised sense, a 'skilled worker') and of course a *craftsman.*" (1958, 44). This idea is in accordance with what Ruskin says, "a true artist is only a beautiful development of a tailor or a carpenter. As the peasant provides the dinner, so the artist provides the clothes and house"[178]. Morris explains that

> Artists. [..] came to see themselves as agents of the 'revolution for life', in their capacity as bearers of the creative imagination [.] it was on this basis that the association of the idea of the general perfection of humanity with the practice and study of arts was to be made. For here, in the work of artists- 'the first and last of all knowledge. as immortal as the heart of man'-was a practicable mode of access to that ideal of human perfection which was to be the centre of defence against the disintegrating tendencies of the age"[179].

Morris claims, people created wonderful works in earlier civilisations, things which fill the men of the modern age with wonder and gratitude at the beauty born from the mind and hands of men in previous centuries which were "common household goods of

---

[178] In Landow (1971, 61).

[179] Quoted in Williams (1958, 42).

those past days"[180]. He thinks that the men, who were 'only' "common fellows"; common everyday labourers, smiths, carpenters and masons, made these treasures: so delicate, so careful, and so inventive that they should be considered artists. Ruskin, in Routh's (1937) view, also wants to direct attention to the craftsman's skill, ingenuity and judgement so as to make us understand that creation and the production of art are not the privileges of Turners but the outcome of labour and perhaps happiness brought about through work. Ruskin distinguishes *artists* according to their world views which are either purist or sensualist For him the naturalist is the one who "takes human being in its wholeness" [181]. He thinks that there are "great men" [182] who are painters but not artists

> at present, who has not much invention, is to take subjects of which the portraiture will be precious in after times [...] views of our abbey and cathedrals; instant views of cities, if possible chosen from some spot in itself notable by association, perfect studies of the battle-fields of Europe, of all houses of celebrated men, and places they loved, and, of course, of the most lovely natural scenery[183].

He is convinced that an artist needs the power of observation and intelligence so that he can be faithful to nature [184]. In his opinion everyone expects the artist to be ingenious. Originality, dexterity, invention, imagination are asked of him "except what alone is to be had for asking - honesty and sound work" (Ruskin 1885, 249). It is work with intellect, a sense of beauty, sensitivity, reflection and knowledge which enables a man to become more than a "lesser man" as Ruskin calls the workers. In respect to work and labour not only can a man be an *artist* but also *Nature* as well. Who else, in Ruskin's opinion, could be considered a greater artist than Nature? Nature with her forms, shapes, colours, patterns, the source of man's mental and physical experience makes Ruskin write:

> there is not a leaf in the world which has the same colour visible over its whole surface; it has a white light somewhere, and in the proportion as it curves to or

---

[180] Morris, *Useful Work vs. Useless Toil,* in Ball ed. (1931, 115).

[181] Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice,* in Evans ed. vol. 1. chp.. 1 (1959, 217).

[182] Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice*, vol.2, ch..6, "The Nature of Gothic," .in Evans ed. (1959, 238).

[183] Ruskin , *Modern Painters* vol. 4. part 5. (1888 19).

[184] Ruskin, *Modern Painters,* vol. 1. chp. 2. (1888:49).

from that focus, the colour is brighter or greyer. Pick up a common flint from the roadside, and count, if you can, its changes and hues of colour[185].

The question also arises here whether man is capable of creating such beauty and miracle as coded in a leaf by Nature's work, If the answer is yes, then how can it be achieved in man's earthly life so that the fruit of his work and labour will be a piece of *art and beauty*[186]? It is also worth mentioning that Morris's question as to in "whose 'hands' should the practice of arts be? is the following. He writes, "[arts should mainly be] kept in the hands of a few highly cultivated men, who can go often to beautiful places, whose education enables them, in the contemplation of the past glories of the world, to shut out from their view the everyday squalors that the most men move in"[187]. In his opinion earlier "all handicraftsmen were artists. But the thought of man became more intricate and difficult to express. And, "labour was more divided among great men, lesser men, and little men [..]. The artist came out from the handicraftsmen, and left them without hope of elevation, while he himself was left without the help of intelligent, industrious sympathy"[188].

This chapter has been concerned with looking at the ideas, concepts and meanings which constitute the notions of *art and beauty* in Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics avoiding discussions on their diverse roles, and maxims within the framework of different theories that have been state throughout centuries. I have intended to emphasise one aspect of the difference which, in my view, lies between the qualities of these artists' way of seeing and treating work and labour and those of the Victorian hegemonic aesthetics[189]. It remains to summarise Morris' and Ruskin's *aesthetics and art and beauty* in the light of *work and labour* below which may show the main qualities of differences mentioned previously.

---

[185] Ruskin, *Modern Painters* vol. 1. sec. 2. chp. .2. (1888, 165).

[186] These two notions are mentioned here together as in Morris's and Ruskin's theories they presuppose each other. Art, produced by both man and nature, is for teaching beauty and serves as a means of creating beauty not only by artists, but also by workmen's hands and mind.

[187] Morris, *The Lesser Arts*, in Briggs ed. (1962, 103).

[188] Morris, *The Worker's Share of Art.* Letter to the Daily Chronicle, 10 November 1893, in Briggs ed. 1962, 140-141.

[189] By this notion I mean the policy, principles, norms and concepts of the dominant culture using and exploiting art and beauty to serve its privileges. Work and labour are not in the vision of their aesthetics as the means and source of producing beauty through which happiness and perfection may occur.

- *aesthetics* is a sphere of life with all its mysterious and realistic qualities that accommodates means, theories and practices to serve people's happiness and strive for perfection by *work and labour,*
- *art* is God's 'gift' expressed and made visible and touchable by the 'media' of Nature. This 'art' is always with us, affects us as long as people, whatever classes they belong to, are sensitive enough to perceive and feel it.
- *art* is a gift' which everyone can experience either as an artist, or by 'being' just a worker or craftsman equipped with the ability to perceive the beauty of the process of creation as well as being participants in creation by work and labour
- art is the source of happiness, freedom, talent, intelligence, knowledge and means of expressing beauty, and perfection learned from and in Nature by *work and labour*
- *art* is a route to getting to know and understanding each other' work, inner self ,ethics and morals
- *art* is mystery which makes *work and labour* worth doing
- *art* is power which should be expressed and realised only in work of beauty and high quality

Now I will examine the meanings of *hegemony and power.* and their relationships between 'cultures'[190] in order to explore the forms, ethical and moral codes of *work and labour* through which I view Morris' and Ruskin's art and beauty as one way of trying to understand political, social and cultural changes; the way toward 'empowering' aesthetics so that it will equally serve everyone's sense of beauty, professional- and self-development to be able to fight for his happiness and rights to a better life.

[190] As already said in chapter 3 the plural form of the word culture by the definition of Clarke et al. eds. (1981) indicates the power relations between cultures, that is subdued classes as well as their relations to the dominant class. Therefore, in support of my argument I will use both forms of culture when examining the meanings of *hegemony and power.*

Chapter 5. Hegemony and Power

In this chapter firstly, I will highlight points from the theories of hegemony and power rooted in Cultural Studies. Secondly, I will examine to what extent and at what levels and in what meanings *power* is different in John Ruskin's and William Morris' aesthetics from that of the "dominant culture" whose main aim was to 'organise' *work and labour* of the "subdominant cultures" around physical and mental exploitation. To do so, I intend to prove the hypothesis of the dissertation toward on the idea that raising ethics and education into the domain of aesthetics through developing sense of beauty may empower aesthetics in such a way that it serves as a means of revolt against ugliness[191] and unhappiness in one's and others' work. The aim here is also to look at the exciting question of whether aesthetics can function in a society other than as the primary means of expressing the dominant classes' power by its "pleasurable conduct" (Eagleton 1990, 42).The answers as to how it is done will be given in Chapters VIII by discussing what Morris' and Ruskin' educative ethics may entail. Raymond Williams (1976) deals with the semantic changes of *hegemony* saying that

> its sense of a political predominance, usually of one state over another, is not common before C19, but has since persisted...together with *hegemonic* to describe a policy expressing or aimed at political predominance. More recently *hegemonism* has been used to describe specifically 'great power' or 'superpower' politics, intended to dominate others... In the 20th century the term has become complicated, especially from the work of Gramsci. In its simplest use it extends the notion of political predominance from relations between states to relations between social classes, as in bourgeois hegemony. [...] it is not limited to matters of political control but seeks to describe a more general predominance which includes . [...]. a particular way of seeing the world and human nature and relationships [....]. It affects thinking about *revolution* (q.v.) in that it stresses not only the transfer of political or economic power, but the overthrow of a specific hegemony: that is to say an integral form of class rule which exists not only in political and economic institutions and relationships but also in active forms of experience and consciousness (1976, 144-145).

[191] This word covers behaviour, language and attitudes towards environment and art.

Williams (1980, 37) explains elsewhere that hegemony and something that is truly total presuppose each other, they are neither secondary or superstructural. Hegemony infects the whole society so deeply that even common sense is under its influence. Foucault puts the role of the individual in the focus of hegemony saying that man is not an "elementary nucleus, a primitive atom, a multiple and inert material on which power comes to fasten" (1980, 98). Hegemony crushes individuals and this is recognised yet practiced by power expressed in certain discourses and desires. Clarke et al.. , (1981, 59-60) referring to Gramsci explain that a special kind of power is practised by hegemony so that there will be alternatives and opportunities to arrive at consent which makes dominant classes' interests, privileges and norms legitime and natural. The ideology whose components are perceptions and meanings defined by hegemony can induce the subordinate class to accept forms, organisations, institutions and laws through which this class can be manipulated. He also suggests that hegemony "is not universal and 'given' to the continuing ruler of a particular class. It has to be won, worked for, reproduced, sustained" (1981, 61). This concept will support my argument later when investigating the 'power' of Morris' and Ruskin's educative ethics that there is a chance of changing people's attitude toward their own and other's *work and labour* by making them aware of ethical and moral questions raised by aesthetics, however utopian a few aspects of their philosophy are. At this point I should mention Williams (1980) opinion, which has been under, claiming that cultures of a society are not conscious of their power. He suggests that if people representing different cultures were conscious of the depth and complexity of hegemony and if the dominant ideology imposed on classes were only "isolable meanings and practices of the ruling class", then it could be easily overthrown. There are, he says, "alternative opinions and attitudes, even some alternative senses of the world" (1980, 39). And, in my opinion, these are levels of power within hegemony which, if they are recognised and taught in a way so that every participant's talent, knowledge and skills are 'activated' by his/her work and labour, may support the effort to affect hegemony differently than is dictated by the "dominant culture".

5.1 "Virtue and Beauty" Against "Pleasurable Conduct"?

Terry Eagleton (1990) sees British aesthetics in the nineteenth-century as one way of expressing and maintaining the power of "the governing bloc". In his opinion, "The whole of social life is aesthetised. The beautiful is just political order lived out on the body, the way it strikes the eye and stirs the heart" (1990, 37). He stresses the power of law being always with us "as the very unconscious structure of our life" and the one which is represented by the "aesthetics of social conduct" (1990, 42). In the light of Eagleton's theory Morris' and Ruskin's 'empowered aesthetics" might have the quality of *"pleasurable conduct"*. And, this quality is the basis of the power of any aesthetics. It is true that for Morris and Ruskin it is aesthetics which is considered as the main focus of their 'revolt' but the reasons for its not having adjusted to the laws and privileges of hegemony and making its impact just because of its "pleasurable conduct" are, in my view, the following. Their views of *work and labour* clearly show the points and levels in which power becomes 'equipped' with new[192] meanings. The power of this aesthetic is rooted in humanism and ethical, moral values initiated by the love of creation and nature. Appreciating the work and labour of others and Nature's work, her perfection, beauty, harmony and peace are as much the qualities of their aesthetics as the analysis of colours, shapes, patterns and decorations. They advocate that man's talent, knowledge and abilities be 'manifested' and multiplied in and by his work. What man produces as a result of this procedure conveys some value[193] which is 'translated' into money. And, this money is not always used to reproduce values again. Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics suggests, in my opinion, that it should acquaint everyone with beauty, provide opportunities for people to experience art, say in the form of a beautiful building, teach them to perceive beauty in and by work, and let them 'taste' what intellectual and environmental creations and change may be brought about. Both knowledge gained by experiencing creation and also by money should serve this creation. One of the conditions of this is, for example, in Ruskin's words, if we seek for beauty in forms which we associate with our everyday life, this is possible

[192] New in the sense that *work and labour* are considered as the main means of change as well as expressing beauty, happiness, goodness and thoughts different both in their principles and attitudes from the practice of the "dominant culture".

[193] By values I mean the ones that are initiated by *art and beauty* opening new perspectives for educative and ethical questions in terms of work and labour, for example, appreciating quality.

"if you do it consistently, and in places where it can be calmly seen; but not if you use the beautiful form only as a mask of things, not if you thrust it into the places set apart for toil" (1849, 123). The question that arises here is, what could be more powerful than *creation* which considers beauty its main aim and makes man's soul and his inner world visible and touchable? I will attempt to answer this question below by analysing their aesthetics through their concepts of *work and labour.* In my view, the levels of power appearing in and by *work and labour* initiated by the attempt to learn from the beauties of both man's and nature's work can be 'traced' in Morris's and Ruskin's arts.

5. 2 Humanism Towards 'Empowering Aesthetics'?

Hegemony and aesthetics are not contradictory notions. Moreover, it is the nature of hegemony and power to draw all human practices into their realms making work and labour serve the privileges as well as reinforcing, reproducing and securing the wealth and comfort of the "dominant culture". Naturally taste, art and beauty belong to the domain of this culture whose participants, in Shiach's (1989) view, set up the criteria and decide on the norms by which other cultures will function. Therefore, I am going to try to answer the following questions:

1. could hegemony be affected by aesthetics which brings new values and norms into practices while offering involvement to all class-cultures into the process in such a way that it may initiate a change in people's world views?
2. could *'work and labour'* through art and beauty be really potential representatives of power at different levels serving as a means of revolt against "artificial famine" (Morris 1872, 94)?

However odd it may seem, I will start the inquiry into this matter by looking at humanism as the first phase of 'empowered aesthetics'. At this point I want to refer back to what Raymond Williams' (1961) says about culture[194] within which 'discourses' on art will synthesise new meanings which will be verbalised and soon make their impact on activities. This approach will help us understand the process and its stages leading to the empowerment of aesthetics as well as its function in education.

Before detailing what meanings of Morris' and Ruskin's humanism may entail, I think, the intellectual content of humanism and the range of its activities are worth

[194] See for more details in chapter 2.

noting here. In so doing I will use Paul Oscar Kristeller's (1965) views rooted in Renaissance humanism. According to his definition the term 'humanism' is widely and rather vaguely used to indicate some kind of emphasis on human values, whether this emphasis is said to be religious or antireligious, scientific or antiscientific"(1965, 3). In Kristeller's view, in a broad sense, intellectuals such as writers, scholars and thinkers are considered humanists. He says, in the fifteenth- and sixteenth –centuries Italian humanism associates humanism with two professions: teachers of humanist doctrines and secretaries who could compose letters. Moral philosophy within which the place of man in the universe with his duties and values were in the focus of the humanists. They accepted the ancient and the medieval grammarians' and literary critics' view, that the giving of moral instructions is the prime duty of intellectuals.

It is true that Morris' and Ruskin's tenets and ideas are similar to those of the ancients[195] and the fifteenth- and sixteenth –centuries. The exciting aspect of their work and humanism, in my view, is to examine how these ethics and morals are by defined by their humanism and adjusted to the social, cultural and aesthetical challenges of the Victorian nineteenth century. In Thorndike's opinion

> for the Victorian, a man was still a shepherd or a poet. looking for something beyond this world; but a man was in addition something that he had never been before, a being increasing yearly in his power over the forces of nature, manipulating huge machines of his own creation harnessing * fire and the lightening, and serenely mastering those very energies in this actual world which had once seemed most transcendent. (1920, 60)

Although the new experiences and discoveries contribute to man's comfort and endeavours to make Nature serve him they also imply new fears and anxieties. All these confirm that however hard man intends to secure his earthly life there will always be some unknown power of Nature which will remind him that he will, at least his physical being, be 'dissolved' and disappear. Man's earthly frailness in the midst of changes has become a more central issue than ever before. Joseph W. Beach observes that man "is so frail and ineffectual a being, his experience and achievements fall so far short of what his ranging imagination conceives and his impetuous heart demands"[196]. Besides being 'frail' Keats' beautiful lines remind people of the

---

[195] Ruskin often refers back to Aristotle and quotes his ideas , .1888 , 57 vol 1 sec. 2. chp..3.

shortness of their earthly life. "Stop and consider ' life is but a day; /A fragile dew-drop on its perilous way / From a tree's summit; a poor Indian's sleep" [197]. In Routh's opinion,

> the humanists born to face this [new] situation had been bred on a literature of an older time, when the prizes of this world had been associated with more human and personal excellences-with heroism in war, with social intercourse and accomplishments, with intellectual interests, or with the natural and bounteous wealth of the land.. No wonder they looked in vain for evidence of man's best self in the mechanised gambles on which this new society subsisted. What most perplexed them was the discovery that people were now literally thinking in terms of debt and credit. Man's sense of effectiveness was to be reckoned as a cash calculation: a column of figures on a piece of paper (Routh 1935, 65).

All these questions also occupy Morris and Ruskin. With their reflections, sensitivity, "aesthetic conscious" (Scott 1914,102) and their philosophy, sometimes consciously and sometimes unconsciously, they strive to understand man's roles and duties in the new world. They place working and creative man with his "personal identity" and sense of beauty at the centre of their theories. I highlight this point of their arts because, in my view, it is their humanism-based aesthetics which makes their ethics clear and easily adjusted to the education of all classes. Their man-focused aesthetics has also given a human reference to their art. In my opinion, first, their humanism urges them to rethink how they could exploit and apply aesthetics, both in theory and practice, so as to be able to find ways out of a society that has "depersonalised and dehumanised" (Altick 1974, 245) life, work and labour. The fact that, especially, Ruskin's attention shifting "from the relation of man and God, to the relation of man and man" (Landow 1971, 91) and feeling the absence of order (aesthetic, ethical and social) also reinforce their man-and- aesthetic focused concepts of the world. It is obvious, in Roes'[198] view, that the cultural, scientific and social changes are also

---

[196] Joseph Warren Beach, *The Concept of Nature in Nineteenth Century English Poetry* (New York: Russel and Russel, 1966).

[197] Keats "Sleep And Poetry". H. W. Garrod ed. *Keats Poetical Works* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1956), 44.

[198] Frederick Roe, *The Social Philosophy of Carlyle and Ruskin* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1921).

accompanied by a claim for restoring faith in humanity, humane relations and individual inner freedom. Ruskin's and Morris' principles are perhaps most clearly presented to us in their interpretations of human existence in which men are "startled by the fading of the sunshine from the cloud of their life into the sudden knowledge that the fabric of it was as fragile as a dream, and the endurance of it as the dew and the duties of this existence towards each other and the environment" (Ruskin 1898, 146). Here the questions arise as to

1. what type of man the nineteenth century has created and which man Ruskin's and Morris's[199] humanism would like to educate so that with the talent and knowledge he has inherited and acquired he could enjoy his life "which puts gesture into clouds, joy into waves, and voices into rocks." (Ruskin, 1886,149) and make it enjoyable for others, and appreciate all the beauties of life and nature?
2. how man should change in and by his work so that it will support his personal and professional development as well as other's knowledge and happiness?

As Routh puts it:" humanists were accustomed to regard man as God's representative on earth. He was endowed with intelligence, in order to carry out his creator's will, in the life he led" (1937, 85). Further, Routh points out that Ruskin "was pleading for a tradition handed down from the humanists of the Renaissance." (1937, 87). Problems of human adjustments were rooted in the life of the new industrial towns, the strenuous, incessant work in factories, mines and mills. It is obvious that the Victorian age translates Man "into an anonymous unit in economic and sociological tables and surveys" (Altick 1974, 345). Man has to face monotony and "endless sameness, and a new quality of boredom" (Altick 1974, 345). The new environment such as architecture, homes and public buildings, as Landow suggests (1971), lack meanings for men. John. Stuart. Mill observes, "Human Nature is not a machine to be built after a model, and set to do exactly the work prescribed for it, but a tree, which requires to grow and develop itself on all sides, according to the tendency of the inward forces which make it a living thing"[200]. It must also be noted that the Carlylean type of Man cannot be considered noble if he is without duties and "pretends to live luxuriously

---

[199] It is worth reading further views of Morris' concepts of man and work in Lewis Peter's ed. book entitled, *William Morris: Aspects of The Man and his Work.* Lloughborough: Victorian Studies Group, 1977).

[200] John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (London: Penguin Books, 1859), 123.

housed up; screened from all work; from want; works and danger; hardship, the victory over which is what we name work" (1843, 180). Schiller speaks about "aesthetic vs. common men". In his opinion, "the aesthetically tempered man will achieve universally valid judgements and universally valid actions, as soon as he has the will to do so" (1967, 163). Unlike the "economic man" who is "only half of a dual personality and is not found outside his specially appropriated haunts- not found, for instance, among the millions that labour on the soil, or in the frontiers" (Routh 1935, 85) Morris' and Ruskin' man is placed in a society which supports creativity, the development of a sense of beauty and thinking. They know that " Man is not an ox, who, when he has eaten his fill, lies down to chew the cud; he is the daughter of the horse leech, who constantly asks for more" (George 1939, 173) Their image of man is the one who knows

> "how to apply labour to art,
> how to produce labourer having special genius, and
> how to preserve his work in the greatest quality" (Ruskin 1907, 22).

This man is

1. a reflective-self and the worker and labourer who can perceive beauty and capable of producing it., without necessarily being an artist in the Turnerian sense [..] if his work is not going to "deprive him of hope" (Morris, 1872, 90) and if he understands the true meaning of his art and work by "working out his own peculiar end"[201] he can call himself a man,
2. a worker who does "living work" and not "dead hand-work" (Ruskin 1886, 56), a man sharing the experience of discovering "the evidence of the magnificent struggle into independent existence" through, for example, architecture (Ruskin 1849, 152),
3. an observer, as the power of observation enables man "to (be) faithful to nature"[202]. John Stuart Mill also considers observation indispensable in man's life and work saying that man "must use observation to see, reasoning and judgement to foresee [....] to decide" (1859, 120),

---

[201] Ruskin, *Modern Painters* vol. 2. sec. 1., chp. 1.(1888, 45)

[202] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1., chp. 2. (1888, 45).

4. a spectator who "may follow out his own thoughts as he would in the natural solitude"[203] ,
5. a person who loves, as Ruskin perceives it, "it is not an indifferent nor an optional thing whether we love this or that; but it is just the vital function of all our being. What we like determines what we are, and it is the sign of what we are, and to teach taste is inevitably to form" (1898, 78). Love does "its own proper work; the only true test of good and bad" love is "the strength of affection"[204] of work, whatever work it is, it is done without love it cannot be considered right,
6. a man who represents the "highest order of creative life" by his mind[205],
7. a human being with "a double creature" meaning that "he has a *true* and *false* faith. He has a true and false hope, a true and false charity, and, finally, a true and false life" (Ruskin 1849, 148),

   "His *true life* is like that of lower organic beings, the independent force by which he moulds and governs external things; it is a force of assimilation which converts everything around him into food, or into instruments; and which however humbly or obediently may listen to or follow the guidance of superior intelligence, never forfeits its own authority as a judging principle, as a will capable either obeying or rebelling." (Ruskin 1849, 143).

   His *false life* is

   [....] that life of custom and accident in which many of us pass much of our time in the world;. in which we do what we have not proposed, and speak what we do not mean, and assent to what we do not understand .[life which] instead of growing and blossoming under any wholesome dew, ..and becomes to the true life what an arboresence is to a tree, a candid agglomeration of thoughts and habits foreign to it, brittle, obstinate, and icy, which can neither bend nor grow (144),
8. a child growing into adulthood, from the "struggle of imperfect knowledge full of promise and of interest" into the age when he is able "to see importance and rigidity settling upon the form of the developed man; to see the types which

---

[203] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. part 2. chp. 1. (1888, 43)

[204] Ruskin *Modern Painters* (1888, 33).

[205] Ruskin *Modern Painters* (1886, 148).

once had the dies of thought stuck fresh upon them, worn flat by overuse, to see the shell of the living creature in its adult form" (Ruskin 1886, 150),

9. someone who can "best feel the difference between rudeness and tenderness in humanity" [206]
10. an artist e.g.. a landscape painter bearing two distinct ends in his mind: "the first, to induce in the spectator's mind the faithful conception of any natural objects., the second, to guide the spectator's mind to those objects most worthy of its contemplation, and to inform him of the thoughts and feelings with which there** were regarded by the artist himself"[207],
11. the "carrier" of asceticism and sensuality not isolating body and souls
12. a theorist and art-critic, having skills and abilities "to enable him to point a scene with words to establish a centre of perception, a narrative eye, next present recognisable elements of pictorial composition, and then move his narrative eye, camera - like, through the elements of the scene he creates for us" (Landow 1971, 234)
13. a worker whose labour should not only produce food but it also should express emotion (Ruskin 1907, 22)

Ruskin's sense of reality helps him not to see man through a distorted mirror. He is very much aware of man's real character. The proof of this is his keen-insight shown by his following lines:

> our respect for the dead, when they are just dead, is something wonderful, and the way we show it more wonderful still. We show it with black feathers and black horses; [..] we show it with black obelisks and sculptors of sorrow, which spoil half of our most beautiful cathedrals...we show it of permitting ourselves to tell any number of lies we think amiable or credible, in the epitaph" (1907, 70).

He also observes further that it is not "the scythe of Time, and the tooth of Time: I tell you, time is scythless and toothless [..] it is we who gnaw like the worm- we who smile like the scythe" (Ruskin 1907, 73).Though Ruskin is not so much an economist as an artist but his effort to understand social problems and the reasons for making millions' lives unworthy of human beings brings the questions of economics into his

---

[206] Ruskin *On The Old Road* (London: George Allen 1885), 280.

[207] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. part 2. sec. 1. chp. 1. (1888, 43)

vision. What is worth mentioning here is that Ruskin approaches the questions of economics not purely from the viewpoint of the market and money but from that of a man asking how the laws and rules of economics could be adjusted to life so that it will support "the wise management of labour" (1907, 9) and of course people. He says that labour should be applied rationally to be able "to obtain the most precious things", presented carefully which also means to keep beautiful embroidery "watch fully from moth", and distributed "to the place where the people are hungry". However well the new type of man knows his purpose, and is "practised in business" if he is "not capable of vision, nor sensitive to sorrow" and does not know "the world surely, and what is the mystery of life to us, is none to them" (Ruskin 1893, 170), then his life is not much worth. Ruskin often raises the question of who can be considered a wise man. As he writes,

> we usually believe in immortality, so far as to avoid preparation for death; and in mortality, is far as to avoid preparation for anything after death. Whereas, a wise man will at least hold himself ready for one or other two events, of which one or other is inevitable; and will have all things ended in other, for his sleep, or left in order, for his advancing (1898, 177).

In sum, Morris's and Ruskin's Man is as much

<u>a reflecting-self</u>	<u>as a labourer</u>
whose facial expression is the chief source of human beauty	who learns the rules of Nature by working and creating
a thinker, a critic, a reader, an artist, an art-collector	refuses to work with "borrowed thoughts" (Ruskin 1849, 152)
who lets beauty affect him and has 'immortal spirit' reflected in his work who looks round "and find dullness unbearable and begin(s) once more inventing,	expresses man's "intellect, soul and physical power" (Ruskin 1906, 98) gives new content to beauty

imitating and imagining [208]

To support my reasoning that Morris' and Ruskin's humanism is a step toward understanding the structure and philosophy of their 'empowered aesthetics' I would refer to Foucault's concept of power (1980, 98) mentioned previously in chapter 4. He emphasises that individuals are not "primitive, elementary atoms" but that it is the individual in whom power is articulated by gestures, discourses and desires. In other words, being either artists or workers it raises man out of the faceless masses. It is his work through which this mental and physical activity influenced by art and beauty represents power. The question to be posed here is what qualities may this power have? According to Foucault "The individual which power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle" (1980, 98). And, man's "vehicle" in Ruskinian and Morris's aesthetics is his work filled with ethical and moral meanings based on their views of art and beauty.

In the next chapter I will turn to show how the process urged by humanism arrives at 'empowering aesthetics' while getting in touch with hegemony.

5.3 Empowered Aesthetics

When we talk about hegemony we primarily think of the dominant class of a society. In Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics, man, the frail, anxious human being comes first whatever "class-culture" he belongs to. They try to make man understand the world through *beauty and art*. Their art, as has been shown before, does not aim to represent the norms, privileges and desires of the dominant class, it is for everyone. By involving the working classes in the realm of power through their work and labour which concepts are rooted in art and beauty may, in my opinion, empower aesthetics with aims, norms and attitudes which assist people to become conscious of the degree of change they can achieve by work. It is even so, when aesthetics is expanded to ethical and moral questions which need to be answered within the realm of education. This is the reason for terming Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics 'empowered aesthetics'.

---

[208] Morris, *The Lesser Arts*, in Briggs ed. (1962, 91).

The working man[209] may become aware of what power his/her *work and labour* may entail, besides earning money, by creating beautiful, useful or ugly things, and to what extent his life may change if in his work[210] he can 'use' values. of *art and beauty* These new[211] values and qualities of work bridge the 'route' from aesthetics toward ethics and morals. They function side by side complementing each other. The fact that Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics intends to protest against the hegemony of dominant cultures by equipping the "subdued classes" with ethics as a means of changing the quality of their own life and work it will enrich the power of *work and labour* with such new ideas as "blessed work", "perfection", "finish" etc. These notions in another context would be in opposition to power, but ethics, morals and education embedded in the philosophy of aesthetics make the whole process more than a mere protest or revolt. It goes beyond it. It uses the power of ethics through aesthetics by trying to institutionalise the power redefined by aesthetics in education. Its aim is not to balance the dominant classes' power against the power of the working classes strengthened by aesthetics and ethics, but to use the power of the 'empowered aesthetics' to make people understand the essence of life, that is, work, as well as to help the members of "dominant culture" to acquire new skills, knowledge and a sense of beauty, so that they will do their best to better the society. For example, :by using and investing their money, their power in values based on aesthetics.

Chapter 6 Work and Labour in the Light of Aesthetics

It is crucial to emphasise that I will examine the qualities of Morris' and Ruskin's concepts of *work and labour* by approaching the questions from two aspects:

1. work and labour "as commodity to be bought and sold in the market as the body of the chattel-slave once had been" (Morris 1994, 511)

---

[209] The notion of working man here does not only cover the members of the working class, but anyone who creates beauty in and from Nature and appreciates as well as protects the values of the past.

[210] A series of research as has proved by now that, in Zweig's (1952) opinion, workers need aesthetic experience as well as self esteem so that they will not "lose their soul". He mentions the work of a building craftsman who works better and produce higher quality of work when working on buildings like town halls and churches, than the one who works on "standard houses". Ferdinand Zweig, The British Worker. (Harmodsworth-Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1952), 99.

[211] New in the sense that these values have been discovered and practiced by reflecting on aesthetics in an age when society defines value mainly by money.

2. work, the ability which enables man to create useful and beautiful things, the means of 'preserving' "peoples' and times' delight in beauty"[212] and expressing the worth of man and his dignity as well as the beauty and perfection of God's work..

I am convinced that with a general overview of the notions of *work and labour* and the way their meanings relate *aesthetics, ethics and education* I will help visualise and understand the structure within which I see these two notions influencing Morris' and Ruskin's conceptions and solutions of social, economic[213] and cultural questions.

For me this **structure** is built up on the followings. The central points are *man* and *God* and it is earthly *life,* and *nature* which reflect and express God's power[214]. By *nature* God offers norms, models, schemes, forms and knowledge so that man's life will be bearable. The main means of a man to be able to express his "inmate self" is his mental and physical ability to create by *work and labour* which makes life worth living. If men the "constructive and progressive creatures, that we are, with ruling brains and forming hands, capable of fellowship" (Ruskin 1893, 177) learn to use their talent, thoughts mainly initiated by beauty found and offered in nature they will be able to better their life. He may also become *happy* whatever he does in his life, but ts chief condition is work of high quality and beauty. Therefore, without perceiving understanding and protecting *beauty* both in nature and by his work man will not fulfil his mission. That is, he will not produce "lasting work" (Ruskin 1849, 16). Work: the "useful, popular, decorative, creative artistic", the "rough and gentle" work (Ruskin 1849, 49) is the means of "understanding nature" (Morris 1872, 195), exploring the "contrast and opposition in nature"[215] and expressing "the society amongst which it exists" (Morris 1890, 84). Work done by handicrafstmen is "the seeds of order and organisation" (Morris 1962, 101). Besides work man does *labour* "the most kind gift of nature" (Morris, 1931, 117) which, if it brings about beauty and art, is equivalent to work. Labour can be "attractive: the best work for man not a burden" (Morris 1994,

---

[212] Morris, *The Lesser Arts,* in Briggs ed. (1962, 88)

[213] I will touch upon Morris' and Ruskin's political and economic views of the topic in question only if these considerations and discussions are indispensable to understand their aesthetics which unites the realms of ethics and education.

[214] By this word I mean the spiritual and mysterious qualities of God that man has attributed to Him as well as man himself: "the soult of the earth" (Morris 1872, 205). I also mean what Ruskin says, the power enabling Him to give "pleasure and toil to us" (1849, 13)

[215] Ruskin 1888, vol. I. chap Vi. sec. I. p. 27.

94) and "unattractive". It is successful labour that helps man to "bear the hardships of existence" (Morris 1962, 101). There is a relationship between *art and labour* as

> art cannot be the result of external compulsion; the *labour* which goes to produce it is voluntary and partly undertaken for the sake of the labour itself, partly for the sake of the hope of producing something which, when done, shall give pleasure to the user of it"[216].

Without art which is

> part of a great system invested for the expression of man's delight in beauty all peoples and times have used them; they have been the joy of free nations, and the solace of oppressed nations[217]

and without being able to produce it *civilisation* is unbearable and unhappy. It is unhappy especially in a money-ridden society when men's "minds are continually set on money-gain, not on mouth-gain, and they fall into every sort of net, [..]dazzled by the coin glitter as birds by the fowler's glass"[218]. *Toil* is "a curse of civilisation" in contrast to work which is "the very blossom of civilisation" (Morris 1931, 120). *Toil* is not interchangeable with work it is not worthy of man. In the civilisation of the 19th century in which man does *work, labour and toil* only art and beauty can make work and labour change and add new meanings to them The ethical and moral meanings of work and labour within the realm of art and beauty should be taught and experienced. For man it is the only way out of the *new machinery*[219] which makes work "speedily done and cheap to buy" (Morris 1872, 96). Besides machinery it is *science* that deeply affects *work and labour* .

> Science will grow more and more one sided, more incomplete, more wordy and useless, till at last she will pile herself up into such a mass of superstition, that

---

[216] Morris, *Signs of Change: :How We Live and How We Might Live,* in Ball ed. (1931, 124.)

[217] Morris, *The Art Of The People,* in Ball ed. .(1931, 14).

[218] John Ruskin, *Unto This Last* (Leipzig: Bernhard Touchnitz, 1906), 105.
Thomas Carlyle also considers money the "miraculous facilities" of modern society and "also what never-imagined confusion, obscurations has it brought in; down almost to total extinction of the moral-sense in large masses of mankind" (1843, 194). He suggests that in course of the century people's desire to show and express the 'embodied spirit of a People's knowledge' in words or on canvas will 'prevail against' the law of market.

[219] Morris makes a distinction between new and old machinery. The latter one is "the improved tool, which is auxiliary to the man, and the only works as long as his hand is thinking" (Morris 1872, 86-87).

beside it the theologyies of old time will seem mere reason and enlightement" (Morris 1872, 95)

Examining this structure in a more subtle way I would also expand it with the following views:

> we are all intended, not to carve our work in snow that will melt, but each and all of us to be continually rolling a great white gathering snowball, brighter and higher-larger and along the Alps of human power [..]"[220].

However much human *knowledge* has increased and developed, and no matter how much modern machines have changed Nature and the work of earlier generations the "rigidity of mind" hinders creativity and affects the *"manner of work"*. What seemed so natural in the past was that all men had to work, everybody even the "earth and the very elements rejoice in doing their appointed work".[221] The civilisation of the nineteenth century had forgotten about this "gain", in other words, the gain of finding enjoyment in work by which a "common fellow" could create wonderful treasures. What has been gained in, for example, architecture is that "we want a show of petty luxury if we are unrich, a show of insulting stupidity if we are rich" Morris (1931,112). *Railroads* were the most striking outcome of *human work*, which had changed the whole of Britain, the so far untouched, rural nature of which the whole nation was so proud:

> It is the very temple of discomfort, and the only charity that the builder can extend to us is to show us, plainly as may be, how soonest to escape from it. The whole system of railroad travelling is addressed to people who, being in a hurry, are therefore, for the time being, miserable. It transmutes a man from a traveller into a living parcel.[222]

---

[220] John Ruskin, *The Political Economy Of Art* (London: Routledge, 1907), 72.

[221] William Morris, *The Art of the People*, in Ball ed. (1931, 117).

[222] John Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps Of Architecture* Chap. IV (London: George Allen, 1849, 121-122). He is not in favour of the present street decorations either which primarily should serve as a means of developing people's sense of beauty. He briefly sums up his opinion, "the whole system of our street decoration based on the idea that people must be baited to a shop as moths are to a candle" (1886, 120) In Shiach's view, "It is in the 19th century that we can first identify a clear and confident equation between technological progress and cultural decline" (1989, 11). Following their line of thoughts these questions may arise here:

1. how money and its relationship with art and beauty are viewed by creative man?
2. is there any hope of producing beauty for the sake of enjoying the beauty of work?

Morris briefly answers these questions claiming that a civilisation which makes profit through the sacrifice of human labour and art and nature destroys the "attractiveness of labour" (1994, 89). He considers the procedure of forcing "man to do day after day the same work, without any hope of escape

In sum, it is *art* by *work and labour* which leads Morris and Ruskin to deal with the questions of *civilisation and culture* while relating the realms of *ethics, morals and education* to each other and giving equal attention to these questions. And this concept, in my view, has lead to the requirements listed bellow:

- to make man responsible for doing his/her best to make life bearable and more beautiful[223]
- to give popular art[224] back
- to chose cleanness instead of dirt: "cleaning should come first"[225]
- to build "decent houses with decent surroundings for every honest and industrious family"[226] (Morris 1931, 105)
- to call people's attention and interest to the matters of everyday life in the present"[227] and not "to waste individuality" Morris 1994, 29)
- to experience "successful labour " which reflects the craftsman's soul, talent and knowledge[228] to make "factories, buildings, and sheds decent and convenient like their homes, [..] even beautiful, so that the glorious art of architecture, now for some time slain by commercial greed, would be born again and flourish" [229]
- education for all people "otherwise what should be expected to come of that?[230]
- "this great country should give the children of these poor folk the pleasures and the hopes of men"[231]

---

or change" which turns "his life into a prison tournament" nothing else but the outcome of the "tyranny of profit girding"[222].

[223] In this context beautiful entails behaviour, language, environment, architecture and work and labour enabling man to create.

[224] Its meaning in Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics is discussed in section 4.4

[225] Morris, *The Art and Beauty of The Earth, in* Ball ed. (1931, 104).

[226] Morris, *The Beauty of Life, in* Briggs (*8*1931, .105).

[227] Morris *The Lesser Art*, in Briggs ed. (1962, 86).

[228] Morris, *Innate Socialism*, in Briggs ed. (1962, 101).

[229] Morris, *Sign of Change. Useful Work v. Useless Toil*, in Ball ed. (1931, 135).

[230] Morris, *The Art and Beauty of The Earth, in* Ball ed. (1931, 105).

[231] Morris, *Hopes and Fears for Art, in* Ball ed. (1931, 106).

- employment which would foster their self-respect and win the praise and sympathy of their fellows" (Morris 1931, 106).

What comes next is to look at questions in more depth that, in my view, will help me come to the understanding of how these two artists' aesthetics combine and relate morals, ethics and education. I will consider each aspect and quality of work and labour discussed below as one level of power initiating and supporting the processes of 'empowering' aesthetics.

6.1 "Blessed" Work; Perfection Implied

Morris emphasises that work can be "a blessing, a lightening of life"[232]. By blessedness[233] he means hope which makes work worth doing. He points out that this hope is threefold: "hope of rest, hope of product, hope of pleasure in the work itself" (118). Carlyle's "practical wisdom" (Routh 1937, 160) when analysing democracy lists cash, wages under the label of labour partaking in shutting up 'God's Temple', "and gradually open(ing) Mammon's Temple' (Carlyle 1843, 209). He considers work noble and sacred. In Roe's (1921, 90) opinion the focus of Carlyle's world is on "good men, mystic creative centres of virtue; each of whom should play his part in the social drama, and so help to bring it nearer to perfection. This perfection can be achieved only by work (Carlyle 1843, 196)". He considers work blessedness observing that "Blessed is he who has found his work.[..] he has a work, a life-purpose; he has found it, and will follow it." (1843, 197). For him work is also mysterious in the sense that only "faith" knows how "every noble work", which is at first 'impossible', is done. It is work by which man can experience and enhance his knowledge. Matthew Arnold (1869) remarks that cultures should pursue the "getting to know" process as the outcome of either physical, intellectual or imaginative work as the means of achieving "total perfection". Morris's and Ruskin's attempt to understand the world and in it man by means of their own "sense of beauty" that fills "the rudeness"[234] (Ruskin 1849,59) of, for example, French Gothic with new meanings. One of these meanings is

---

[232] Morris, *Useful Work Versus Useless Toil*, in Briggs ed.(1962, 117).

[233] Both Morris and Ruskin are aware of how important this notion is in the Protestants ethic. But an analysis of this would go beyond the scope of this dissertation.

perfection representing pure and great work done with interest and willingness. The idea of perfection, as Ruskin sees this issue, should also involve the best materials and *quality*[235]: What he says is "choose [..] if not stone, brick, but the best brick; preferring always what is good of a lower order of work or material, to what is bad of a higher order; " so as to be able "to improve every kind of work, and to put every kind of material to better use (1849, 22). By reflecting on the nature of hope regarding work Morris arrives at a very crucial point perceiving that "Whatever pleasure there is in some work, there is certainly some pain in all work, the beast-like pain of stirring up our slumbering energies to action, the beast-like dread of change when things are pretty well with us"[236]. This line of thought warns us that when talking about the degree and types of power of work both *pain* and *change* should also be taken into consideration.

In sum, it can easily be accepted that work of quality involves hope and may indicate happiness, to some degree, and for both the maker and the user it 'strengthens'[237] the power of work. From this it follows the question of what is meant by power here? In my view, we can find answers if we investigate Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics from the perspective of "class cultures" attitudes (Clarke et al.. 1981, 88) to work, the types of work they produce and whether perfection and beauty are represented and expressed by work. Morris observes, work "is portioned out very unequally amongst the different classes of society" (1962, 119). As Routh (1935, 99) writes,

> labour is absorbed and associated by the factory; the working man exists only as a small part of the machinery, easily replaced, and maintained only so far as he can contribute to the functioning of the capitalised monster. It need not be

---

[234] By rudeness they mean the uneven, rough surface of pieces of work witnessing the power and beauty of man's physical work which has not been ruined by machines

[235] I will offer more details in chapter 8.

[236] Morris, News From Nowhere. In Briggs ed. (1962, 189).

[237] Ferdinand Zweig in his book, entitled *Labour, Life And Poverty* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1949), 71 observes that the prevailing tone of societies is determined by happiness and unhappiness originating in and spread by individual human beings. Our duty is to strengthen people's happiness.

added that a human being who wears out his life in such minute and mechanical occupations, has missed the purpose for which he was born.[238].

Against this type of work Morris and Ruskin offer the work of the "aesthetic man" which will not bring about some power to change environment and design architecture that is not in harmony with Nature. This work has its impact on others' work not on account of its "pleasurable conduct" (Eagleton 1990, 42). By involving man's soul and body through making him experience perfection and beauty their aesthetics prepare man to start thinking of the essence of his and others' work. They believe in these qualities. Meanwhile, they keep in mind that work is the main source of man's physical existence .

6.1.2 Happiness in Work and by Work?

The issue of happiness, as Alan Gewirth sees it, "goes back to Hobbes if not Plato [and] the only way to be sure of attaining one's own happiness is giving equal consideration to the happiness or interests of all other persons who are affected by one's action"[239]. The ideas of happiness in the Victorian age reflect social, cultural, and moral pursuits by individuals and groups to decrease the anxiety of being "frail and ineffective" (Beach 1966) which man has to realise when comparing his power to that of the mysterious universe. in the "modern civilisation [which] is on the road to trample out all the beauty of life" and ruin "the work of the world"[240]. It is no wonder that sensitive artists and theorists of the age attempt to find ways of experiencing happiness. James Mill sees "greatest happiness" in "the horizon of morals" and in the "the object" of a good government when [...] carrying the diminution of evil, or the increase of happiness, to its maximum" (1829, 140). Carlyle considers happiness the 'condition' of the "elaborate civilisation" (Morris, 1872), that is, "to get his work done. Not 'I can't eat! but 'I can't work! that was the burden of all wise complaining men." (1843, 157). In Morris' and Ruskin's views one way of surviving the modern world

---

[238] J.A. Hobson is right when he claims, "A system which concentrates all thought upon profit, iinstead of upon quality of work or excellence of achievement, inevitably damages the character of work, and does not secure the utility it professes to serve. God's work can only be the result of a conscious effort to work well" (1898, 130).

[239] Alan Gewirth, *Reason And Morality* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978), 19.

which "is everywhere growing uglier and more commonplace" (Morris 1972, 84) is to practice and experience art and beauty. It is the work of mind and hands equipped with a sense of beauty that enable men to create "not labour for profit, or for production, or for the smooth functioning of existing order." (Williams 1958, 141). This experience may bring about happiness especially when workers "could not chose but express, some original thought both interesting and beautiful"[241]. Morris says, "the reward of labour is life [..] *all* work is now pleasurable; either because of the hope of gain in honour and wealth with which the work is done, which causes pleasurable excitement [..] or else because it has grown into a pleasurable *habit*"[242]

Labour is the kindest gift of nature, the most natural gain of mankind and the main source of happiness, claims Morris[243]. He approaches the issue of happiness by two moods "the mood of energy it makes and the mood of idleness" (1872, 81) which makes man unhappy. But a man needs both of these two moods as they balance each other. He also thinks that the "true secret of happiness" should be rooted in the "genuine interest in all the details of daily life" (1872, 94). Morris deals with idea of happiness in terms of work within the concepts of socialist philosophy[244], He thinks that the ideal "social emancipation" would be if man could experience real happiness by getting rid of work as being servitude and oppression By contrast of work as evil task Morris emphasises that work is

> the highest, the most God like of all human capacities [...] to all living things there is pleasure in the exercise of their energies. But a man at work, making something which he feels will exist because he is working at it and wills it, is

---

[240] Morris, *Hopes and Fears for Life: The Beauty of Life* in Ball ed. (1931, 82).

[241] Morris, *Hopes and Fears for Life. The Beauty of Life,* in Ball ed. (1931, 83).

[242] Morris *News From Nowhere* James Redmond ed. (London and New York 1970), 275.

[243] Morris, *Hopes and Fears for the Art*, in Ball ed. (1931, 117).

[244] Marx's tenets deeply influence Morris. Glassier in his book entitled, *William Morris And The Early Days Of The Socialist Movement* 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1921) examines this aspect of Morris's art. and believes that Morris's plunging into socialism helps him resolve serious economic and social injustices and contradictions. Friedrich Engels considers him "a settled sentimental socialist" 'Letter to Laura Lafargue, 13 September 1886, in Friderich Engels, Paul and Laura Lafargue: *Correspondence* (Lawrence and Wishart, 1950,). 370 vol. 1. In 1883 he joined H.M. Hyndman's Democratic Federation and in 1884 he founded the Socialist League and became the editor of Commonweal, the organ of the party. He published his socialist prose romance 'The Dream of John Ball in 1888 and the following year his utopian romance "News From Nowhere".

exercising the energies of his mind and soul as well as of his body [...]. Not only his thoughts, but the thoughts of past ages guide his hand, and as part of human race he creates. If he works thus, we shall be men, and our days in the world will be happy." (Glasier 1921, 147).

Morris also observes that *work* which is exercised in art may add more pain[245] to man's labour, but in his opinion it is worth enduring extra pain of labour that "is undertaken with the aim of satisfying that mood of energy by employing it to produce something worth doing [...] in which there is absolute immediate pleasure"(1872, 84). Ruskin's (1886) concept of happiness in relation to work raises the question of how a man could be happy when working very hard. His answer is that however hard, for example, a carver works he should have some pleasure in his labour otherwise "it will not be living". To define what he means by this he offers the following example: "There is a Gothic church lately built .many of the details are designed with taste, and all evidently by a man who has studied old work closely. But it is all as dead as leaves in December [...] there is not one tender touch, not one warm stroke [...]. The men who did it hated it, and were thankful when it was done" (1886, 173). When analysing Pre-Raphaelitism (1885) Ruskin approaches 'happiness' in work by looking at, first, 'unhappiness'. Unlike Morris he does not think that man needs the experience of being unhappy in his work. He writes, "unhappiness in itself [is] a violation of divine law, and a sign of some kind of folly or sin ..in order that people may be happy in their work, these three things are needed:

they must be fit for it;

they must not do too much of it [...].and they must have a sense of success in it [...] a sure sense, or rather knowledge, that so much work has been done well, and fruitfully done" (1885, 240).

For Ruskin the right question to ask, regarding happiness is simply this, "was the carver happy while he was about it? It may be the hardest work possible, the harder because so much pleasure was taken in it; but it must have been happy too, or it will not be living" (1849, 173). According to Ruskin and Morris work, either useful or beautiful, should reflect and bring about happiness of both the maker and the user. It is work and labour that make it possible to be "part of a system [art] invented for the

[245] I touched upon the question of pain in the previous section.

expression of man's delight in beauty"[246]. Morris and Ruskin 's aesthetics makes us see goodness and happiness as the means of the 'renewal' of brain and soul; and a new kind of activity open to everyone. They are convinced that by the meanings their aesthetics bring about work and labour man can change and better his life. To the question of how could it be done they answer that

1. man should do the "right kind of work" (Ruskin) in whatever roles he does his job e.g.: an artist, craftsmen etc. as lack of work causes anxiety, anger which can manifest itself in revolt and destruction,
2. man should be educated: to reflect on the importance of protecting Nature's work as well as the work of the past e.g. "[...].the upraising of the great Cathedral front, with its beating heart of thoughts of men wrought into the leaves and flowers of the fair earth, wrought into the faces of good men and true fighters against the wrong, wrought through the laps of years and years by the dirt of chisel and stroke of hammer into stories of life and death[247],
3. man should be taught to perceive and enjoy creation, intelligent and imaginative work to be able to become aware that " as long as there are cold and nakedness in the land around you, so long there can be no question at all but that splendour of dress is a crime" (Ruskin 1907, 52) and how not
4. "to become more and more degraded", man should strive against the overwhelming force that brings about starvation, overwork, dirt and ignorance (Morris, 1872),
5. man should be sensitised to appreciate work of quality by personal and professional development,
6. man should be educated to value work regardless of whether the 'worker' is an artist or a peasant since "an art of peasants' in its simplicity and beauty and whose roots are in nature, and in what peasants experienced, observed and built in their houses, and humble village church[248],
7. man should realise what his duties are as a member of the ruling class and how to support other cultures "stimulated by that love which Nature [...] has implemented in us" (Morris 1872, 95).

---

[246] Morris, *The Lesser Arts, in* Briggs ed. (1962, 88).

[247] Morris, *Shadows of Amiens*, in Ball ed. (1931, 49).

[248] Morris, *The Lesser Arts*. in Briggs ed. (1962, 97.

6.1.3 "Additional Labour" and "Finish"

As already be shown the meaning of labour in Morris's and Ruskin's arts goes beyond its strictly social, physical or mental domains. Labour can be, for example, a touch of brush, or a hoe in a piece of art which makes it more than a good piece of work of a skilled craftsmen.

This "additional labour" is needed in any man's work for the work to be considered art. Ruskin considers artistic pictures the media of "sensation power" which, in his opinion, is "the highest ideas of power which obtains the most perfect end with the slightest possible means"[249]. He goes on to say, "The quality of work in the sketch is necessarily less in proportion to the effect than in the picture; but yet the picture involves the greater power; if out of all the *additional labour* bestowed on it, not a touch has been lost"[250]. Finish conveys the meaning of a perfect piece of work. Ruskin distinguishes "useful and useless finish" as well as "substantial and apparent finish". He offers the following, for example, "the hammering and welding which are necessary to produce a sword blade of the best quality, are useful finishing; the polish of its surface useless[251]. Finish also depends on ideas "whenever finish is given for the sake of realisation, it is wrong; whenever it is given for the sake of adding ideas it is right. All true finish consists in the addition of ideas, that is to say, in giving the imagination[252] more food"[253]. Ruskin also considers "natural objects" as "the appearance of care or finish, the condition of the universe, delicacy and precision which no human hand can follow" (1849, 139). He is also aware of the difference between the finish man can produce and that of God who alone can finish[254]. He stresses that " it is not a little absurd to weary ourselves in struggling towards a point.

---

[249] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. sec. 2., chp. 1. (1888, 33).

[250] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. sec. 2., chp. 1. (*1*888:33-34)

[251] Ruskin, *Modern Painters* vol. 3, part 4, chp. 9. In Evans ed. (1959, 82).

[252] Mary D. Goetz, M.D. deals with Ruskin's ideas of imagination in depth: in her book entitled, *A Study of Ruskin's Concept of Imagination* (Washington. D.C.: The Catholic University Of America,1947). It is also worth reading Michel Sprinker's ((1978) analysis regarding Romantic imagination and grotesque in *Imaginary Relations. Aesthetics and Ideology in the Theory of Historical Materialism.* (London: Verso), 1987, as well as Althusser's theories (in Sprinker ed., (1978, 19-22) and Paul de Man's *The Rethoric of Romanticism.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984).

[253] Ruskin *The Lamp Of Beauty*, in Evans ed. (1959, 61).

which we never can reach, and exhaust our strength in vain endeavours to produce qualities which exist inexhaustibly in the commonest things around us"[255]. Finish and producing "varied forms" cannot be done at the same time. [256] and it should be decided, says Ruskin, whether the worker will be made a man or a grindstone [257]. For Ruskin there another kind of finish, that is, "right and high finish". He states, "Right finish is simply the full rendering of the intended impression, high finish is the rendering of a well intended and vivid impression; and it is oftener got by rough than fine handling" (1849, 170). In relation to finish Morris mentions "workmanlike finish [which] is necessary, but finish to be workmanlike must always be in proportion to the kind of work"[258].

6.1.4 God's Work, Divine Power ?

Here I will consider the impact of restlessness and disillusions troubling artists[259], philosophers, writers and poets in their relationships with religion and God. In so doing, I intend to look at the changing values of the nineteenth century[260] affecting people's attitudes towards God and Divine Power. Then, I will narrow down this question to a more specific topic, that is, Morris's and Ruskin's way of seeing God's role in 'interpreting' the work which man should do to be able to live a life worthy of his mental and physical capacities. It is necessary to state here that to detail the phases of Morris' and Ruskin's religious development and changes is not the aim of this study. It is only touched upon so as to advance our understanding of how their aesthetics deals with Divine Work and its power[261] and where and in which forms this power

---

[254] Ruskin, *Writings on Art.*, in Evans ed.. (1959, 82)..

[255] Ruskin, *Modern Painters* vol. 3. part 4., in Evans ed. (1959, 82).

[256] Ruskin, *Modern Painters* vol. 2. chp .6. 1886.

[257] I will look at the answers as to whether man or grindstones should be educated in chapter 8..

[258] Morris *Lectures on Art and Industry. The Lesser Arts of Life.* In Ball 1931, 167).

[259] I discussed the meanings of artist in chapter 4.

[260] Applying Altick's (1974) and Young's (1960) views in chapter 3 investigated what fears and hopes the changes in the nineteenth century brought about.

appears and should be expressed. By discussing the qualities and the power of God's work within the realm of *art and beauty* and through this its relation to man's *work and labour* I want to make the following observation.

Morris and Ruskin, in my view, look at God's work primarily as the inexhaustible source of grace, beauty and perfection whose power bears the marks of these qualities thus, lacking any authority and obligation which so often accompany man's work and labour. I will offer here some aspects of Routh's argument that, "among people of culture there was little doubt that the Divine Will was the best guide on earth. The Divine Will gave human nature its grandest opportunity. The presence of the Deity guaranteed the greatness of Man" (1935, 57). But gradually, writes Routh, along with the industrial and scientific changes people who still echo St. Paul, "by the Grace of God I am what I am" start to discover that their belief in God no longer ensure their sense of security and feeling of trust either in Divine Power or in "human dignity". Modern rationalism has initiated a progress in which

> things started to develop on their own accord, in their own way, and man, the crown of creation, the representative of God, was no longer the master-mind. He was himself falling under the subjection of laws [..] *Laws* are imposed on Nature and social evolution by man's intelligence. But in the nineteenth century they were not imposed by man's will. They were alien to his sense of initiative and purposiveness; they deprived him of the mastery which he enjoyed under Divine authority; they outraged the sentiments in which his nature had found self-expression" (Routh 1935, 58).

Matthew Arnold points out, "man is a finite substance, that is, he has but a limited degree of being, or perfection. God is an infinite substance, that is, he has an unlimited degree of being, or perfection." (1970, 178) Ruskin is "tinctured with culture and sanctified with religion" (Routh 1935, 67-68) in his family. His talent and genius have assimilated the experience he has gained in a "commercial and Calvinist household" in a way which has not made him revolt against the family traditions, but "renewed and humanised" his religion and God's role in it. Actually he "made his sense of religion serve his sense of beauty" (Routh 1935, 69). George Landow (1971) believes that the

---

[261] I consulted Jennifer Hart "Religion and Social Control in the Mid-Nineteenth Century" In A.P. Donajgrodzki ed. *Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britain.* (London: Croom Helm, 1977), 118-137,. for understanding the role of God in relation to power expressed by the authority of governments and institutions so that man will be made to accept obedience.

development of Ruskin's aesthetics reflects his changing attitudes towards religion[262]. The fact that Ruskin who never able to get rid of the Evangelical Anglican influence is shown by his following few lines: "God shows us in himself, .not only authoritative perfection, but even the perfection of obedience- an obedience to his laws." (Ruskin 1886:44). Elsewhere he says, "in whatever object of life, in whatever may be infinitely and for itself desired, we may be sure there is something of the divine; for God will not make anything an object of life to this creature which does not point to, or partake of, Himself"[263]. Ruskin writes that "a man is known to his dog by the smell, to his tailor by the coat, to his friend by the smile; each of these knows him, but how little, or how much depends on the dignity of the intelligence. That which is truly and indeed characteristic of the man, is known only to God"[264]. It is only God, he thinks, who can "awaken the depth and the mystery" of the souls[265].

Analysing Architecture Ruskin groups intellectuals into two great 'Lamps' which are: "the works of God upon the earth, and the other is in an understanding of the dominion over those works which has been vested in man" (1849, 72). It is interesting to see that Ruskin connects *taste* and *"universality"* to the notions of *God* when contemplating beauty. What he says is that "if [we] can only admire this thing or that, we may be sure that our cause for liking is of a finite and false nature. But if we can perceive beauty in everything of God's doing, we may agree that we have reached the true perception of its universal laws"[266]. Further he points out "true taste is for ever growing, learning, reading, worshipping, laying its hand upon its mouth because it is astonished, lamenting over itself, and testing itself by the way that it fits things. And it finds where of to feed, and whereby to grow, in all things." (1888, 24). Therefore, in Ruskin's interpretation possessing "true taste" presupposes the ability, first, to perceive beauty created by God. From this our sense of beauty may lead us to

---

[262] Landow (1971, 243-244) divides the history of Ruskin's religious development into four periods: "in the first years of firm Evangelical belief, which lasted about 1848, he accepted his parents' religion; he then experienced ten years of often bitter and painful doubts which culminated in his decisive loss of religion in 1858, seventeen years of confused agnosticism; and finally in 1875 he came to rest in a personal, rather strange version of Christianity". Morris e.g. in his youth intends to form a religious order, instead he has founded a brotherhood of "artisans".

[263] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 2. part 3. sec. 1. (1888, 14(.

[264] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. part 2., chp. 1 (1888, 55).

[265] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. part 2. sec. 1. chp. 3. (1888, 5).

[266] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 2., chp. 3. (1888, 24).

develop taste and get closer to understanding 'universal' relations and within them the work of God. This rises the following question,

- does this mean that people not being capable of perceiving God's work either in Nature or in man's work will never experience Divine Power?

I think the answer is given by their whole philosophy which emphasises Divine Power besides that of man's work and labour which cannot be attributed purely to his mental and physical capability but also to God. In Ruskin's view, for example, good architecture is "the work of a believing man" (1898, 89). He proceeds "good architecture is essentially religious and the production of a faithful and virtuous, not of a corrupted people" (89). He (1886) thinks that God's work, has been offered for our delight and contentment in His world. "And all noble ornamentation is the expression of man's delight in God's work". Ruskin believes that the strength of beautiful ornaments lies in "the pleasure we have in these geometrical figures of our own invention" (1886, 219) as well as "in the natural tendency impressed on us by our Creator to love the forms into which the earth He gave us to tread, and out of which He formed our bodies, knit itself" (1886, 220). The "strength of divinity" should be recognised "in all mighty things", says Ruskin, but man thinks that he is able "to do great things by help of iron bars and perspiration- we shall do nothing that way but lose some pounds of our weight" (1885, 245). The "blessedness" of Divine work in Morris' and Ruskin's theories is different from the notion of Carlyle's blessedness voiced in his pragmatic interpretations. In their arts God's work recurs most frequently in relation to Nature as the earthly 'representation' of Divine power. It is the wonders of Nature which go beyond human understanding and make it possible for man to work in and from Nature using it as a source for his imagination and knowledge and the source of raw materials (wood, paint, paper, glass etc.) enabling him to copy the beauty of Nature and to create which only man can do in the universe besides his Master: Therefore, in my view, in these relations it is *work and labour* which directly 'interpret' Divine power, that is God's work, to man through and in Nature. Unlike scientists who lay stress on "the scientific desire to stress the regularity of natural law and eliminate the arbitrary and irrational from the process of the universe" (Beach, 1966, 6). Morris and Ruskin look at Nature as the medium of Divine work; the expression of Divine power in earthly materials.. The focus of their theory is on the

"sense that [man] stands alone in the universe [...]. .He has an overpowering impulse to construct a system which will enable him to feel that he does not stand alone but "is intimately associated with some force or group infinitely more powerful and insignificant than himself." (Beach 1966, 8). The 'construct Morris and Ruskin have created for supporting man to understand the world and his "frailness" is aesthetics. The following lines by Ruskin shows how complex his philosophy is when attempting to understand the role of God's and Man's work,

> The harmony of God's work is not in us interrupted by the mingling of universal and peculiar principles: for by these such difference is secured in the feelings as shall make fellowship itself more delightful, by its inter-communicative character; and such variety of feeling also in each of us separately as shall make us capable of enjoying scenes of different kinds and orders, instead of morbidly seeking for some perfect epitome of the Beautiful in one.[267].

Ruskin suggests that "an artist's labour is quiet and steady and the natural and unforced results of such work will be always the things that God meant to him to do" (1885, 246). The power man's work embodies in the mirror of Divine work.suggests following question:

- can there be a bigger power than learning from the perfection of God's work available for all of us in every minor particle of Nature as well as in our soul, talent and knowledge?

To identify and place the phenomenon of Nature in Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics, in my view, we should examine not only the relationship between Nature and God in the light of Divine mightness[268], but also the meanings attached to *work and labour* by learning from her work and following her laws in the process of man's creation. Therefore, in the following phase of the study I will,

- first, clarify what is meant by Nature before considering how Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetic concepts have made them view this notion. I will do this by concentrating on the following issues:

---

[267] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 2. (1888, 34).

[268] It is worth mentioning that Morris' and Ruskin's concepts of the word "divinity" not only convey the meaning of God's power to create, which is a continuous process in the Earth represented by the ever renewing beauty of nature and man's capability to create beauty by himself, but also denotes man's relationship with God and man and his learning from her work and following nature's laws.

- the worth of man's work and new kinds of activity brought about by recognising the "spots of Nature's blackness" as a means of teaching man to perceive and create

It needs to be emphasised that my aim here is not to analyse in depth the ever-changing philosophy of Nature and give an overview of the concepts that have been developed by the theories drawn from Cultural Studies. I will only apply Raymond Williams' concept of Nature to advance us in answering the questions listed above.

6.1.5 Work of Nature; Power of Work by and in Nature

Raymond Williams (1980) states that no one can be neutral when attempting to indicate just few points of such a vast topic as nature. He starts his analysis by saying that the earliest speculations about nature express ideas based on observations and physical inquiries. He is convinced that the dominant interpretations are idealist, metaphysical, or religious. In his view, "Nature is a ruthlessly competitive struggle for existence; an extraordinary interlocking system of mutual advantage; a paradigm of interdependence and co-operation"(1980, 70). By making the word Nature singular it has one single principle. This is, "Nature the minister of God. To know Nature was to know God." (71). He goes on to say that nature in the medieval world represents order. It is nature which expresses divinity and the laws derives from this order. The critical question is whether the notion of nature involves man. Williams' answer is the following:

> The order of nature, which expressed God's creation, included, as a central element, the notion of hierarchy: man had a precise place in the order of creation, even though he was constituted from the universal elements which constituted nature as a whole (74).

The shift from a metaphysical to a naturalistic view leads to a new approach. The relationship between nature and social man has become the focus. The industrial revolution and the development of science make people see nature "as a set of objects, on which men could operate" (77). Ladd' thinks that "the rigid forms of privilege and mechanical order gave way before the principles of laissez faire [ ] in artistic taste, naturalism destroyed the barriers of a grand style. For nature, in both its human and external features, appeared in a new light" (1932:46-47). He goes on to say, "Nature's

unconsidered variety became the very type and criterion of beauty, and men were led by an inevitable consequence to value what is various, irregular, or wild" (60). A new way of seeing nature appears in Darwin's Nature according to Thorndike (1920, 225), and that of Mammon, which is different from "all that was not touched by man, spoilt by man: nature as the lonely places, the wilderness" (Williams 1980, 77). Beach points out that the Romantic concept of nature lays the emphasis on man who has moral significance regarding his relationship with nature. And, his children will pass over "the blessed saga" (1966, 7), the knowledge, the feelings and emotions man has learned from nature. To exemplify how Nature and Man are considered by a Romantic artist I will quote Wordsworth's lines, "a Poet considers man and nature as essentially adapted to each other and the mind of man as naturally the mirror of the fairest and most interesting qualities of nature" (1984, 606). When we turn to consider what meanings Nature has in the nineteenth century we should also bear in mind that, says Beach (1966), man is supported by his faith to grasp at "the great benevolent order" and experience harmony through every lovely and sublime object. Raymond Williams sees Nature also as "the green vision of Constable; the green language of Wordsworth and Clare [...] and then with increasing power in Wordsworth and beyond him, there came the sense of nature as a refuge, a refuge from man; a place of healing, a solace, a retreat" (1980, 80). In parallel with the development of the sciences and along with Darwin's evolutionary theory man has to face new challenges and new fears and 'digest' new knowledge. He has to strive to find ways to relieve the "intolerable burden of loneliness", and to understand his relationship with nature and his new roles[269] in the world. man starts experiencing the fact that his knowledge and work will enable him to affect nature "to try ourselves against Nature" (Carlyle 1843, 160) to such an extent that it will serve man's own comfort and well-being. By looking at the main changes in the concept of Nature Williams arrives at the conclusion that in the nineteenth century

> The social jungle, the rat race, the territory-guarders, the naked apes. was how an idea of man re-entered the idea of nature. A real experience of society was projected, by selective examples, on to a newly alienated nature [...].

[269] By roles here I mean those which are imposed on man by the development of sciences, industry and economy. For example, a worker who is not involved in the whole process of production but forced to do some mechanical work, just a mere phase of the whole process.

> What once had been a ratification, a kind of natural condition , [...] of ruthless economic selfishness- the real ideology of early capitalism and of imperialism- became, towards our own day, not only this but a hopelessness, a despair, an end of significant social effort. (1880, 82)

Ashcroft[270] sees labour, "profit-bearing employment", in relation to Nature as the means of using and exploiting her raw materials to maintain man's values and desires. Bearing this in mind it makes, in my view, Morris' and Ruskin's theories of Nature more exciting. The fact is that though both of them are aware of how arrogantly and aggressively industrial and scientific developments have changed values, morals, attitudes towards Nature and man's relationship with Nature they have not opted for similar means to strive for harmony, cleanness and order, but used beauty and art offered by Nature; Nature that has become a new, seemingly, inexhaustible source of exploitation. And, in their view, man's work is nothing else according to Mammon's concept, but the means of getting and gaining more from Nature. Consequently, Nature's work is also subordinated to the endeavours and demands of money and machinery. Within the horizon of how this question is dealt with in their art it is worth starting with Ruskin's words:

> as we travel the way of life, we have the choice, according to our working, of tuning all the voices of Nature into one song of rejoicing, and all her lifeless creatures into a glad company, where of the meanest shall be beautiful in our eyes. [...] or, of withering and quenching her sympathy into a fearful withdrawn silence of condemnation, or into a crying out of her stones, and a shaking of her dust against us[271]

Wealth is nature and this is the real power, says Morris. By wealth he means:

> what Nature gives us and what a reasonable man can make out of the gifts of Nature for his reasonable man. The sunlight, the fresh air, the unspoiled face of the earth, food, raiment, and housing necessary and descent; the storing up of knowledge of all kinds, and the power of disseminating it; means of free communication between man and man; works of art, the beauty which man creates when he is most a man, most aspiring and thoughtful[272].

---

[270] T. Ashcroft, *English Art And Society* (London: Peter Davis, 1936), 44.

[271] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 2. chp 4. (1888, 33).

[272] Morris *Useful Work Versus Useless Toil.* In Briggs ed. (1962, 121).

He also thinks that "everything made by man's hands has a form, which must be either beautiful or ugly; beautiful if it is in accordance with Nature, and helps her; ugly if it is discordant with Nature and towards her" (1962, 85). Ruskin is convinced that only natural objects being the "condition of the Universe" can follow "delicacy and precision" (1849, 139) and man's hand is incapable of doing it. Of course a genius is capable of creating pieces of work similar to that of Nature's, he is aware that "Nature does it in a variegated flower; not one leaf red and another white, but a point of red and a zone of white, or whatever it may be, to each" (1849, 138). But, what about the majority of people who are not so lucky as to be gifted with such talent as, for example, Turner? The answer lies in their theories regarding practice.[273]. There is another aspect of Ruskin's way of seeing beauty of Nature which is worth mentioning. He insists, besides beautiful objects Nature offers "deformed parts" which are needed to be perceived as beautiful things cannot be considered beautiful in a pure "undiseased nature"[274]. "Spots of blackness [275] which contrast the beauties of Nature can be noticed by the "perceiving mind". These spots are present everywhere. Their role in man's life is "to make its [the creation's] colours felt" (1888, 27). Morris also sees clearly the difference between Nature and Man in this respect, but he emphasises Man's 'spots' saying that "Nature will go on with her eternal recurrence of lovely change- spring, summer, autumns, and winter, sunshine, rain, and snow; [meanwhile man] has deliberately chosen ugliness instead of beauty, and live where he is strongest amidst squalor or blank emptiness"[276]. Morris warns us to appreciate Nature's beauty as civilisation has already done its 'share' by having lost romance and "the instinct of beauty". For him Nature means "pure air, clean rivers and mountains free from fence". Man treats Nature, this jewel, "as if it were any common stone kicking about on the highway, good enough to throw a dog"[277]. The following lines by Ruskin illuminate to what power he attributes to work which makes possible to build by learning forms,

---

[273] Their educative is detailed in chapter 8.

[274] Ruskin, *Modern Painters*: *Of Ideas of Beauty* (1888, 27).

[275] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. chp. 6. sec. 1 (1888:27).

[276] Morris *The Love Of Arts*, in Ball ed. (1931, 142)

[277] Morris *Lecture on Socialism, in* Ball ed. (1931, .109-110).

structures and laws from Nature. The work expressed and realised in Architecture is no less powerful than that of Nature's:

> we have other sources of power, in the imagery of iron coasts and azure hill; of power more pure, nor less serene, than that of the hermit spirit which once lighted with white lines of cloisters the glades of Alpine pine, and raised into ordered spires the wild rocks of the Norman sea...and lifted, out of the populous city, grey cliffs of lonely stone, into the midst of sailing birds and silent air (Ruskin 1849, 102).

It is man's work which enables him to express his thoughts, emotions and sense of beauty in buildings

> architecture, in borrowing the objects of Nature, is bound to place them, as far as may be in her power, in such associations as may befit and express their origin. [..] she is nevertheless to place her most exuberant vegetable ornament just where Nature would have placed it, and to give some indication of that radical and connected structure which Nature would have given it" (Ruskin 1849, 114).

Architecture interprets and transfers the power of Nature by work. In Morris's and Ruskin's theory this power is an everlasting memento, unless ruined by man's hammers, of man's talent, imagination, taste and humanism expressed by work. The components of the process until a piece of beauty is born are those of the power that made forms, shades, "spots of blackness"[278] and colours born in Nature live and attainable for man. This power equips man with skills, knowledge and talent with the ability to copy and 'immortalise' the beauties of Nature. The media in this process is the sense of beauty leading man to produce something which strengthens the power of man's work. By this it is possible to touch the curves of a leaf formed in a piece of marble or enjoy the sapphire-deep colour of the sea on a painting.

In sum, Nature for Morris and Ruskin 'transmits' the power of God making it possible for man to live, work, create and think as well as synthesise the beauty of Her gift, that is, Nature by work in art and 'useful things'. Nature, the bearer and the condition of human existence, gives shelter to man, both the creator and the destroyer. She is also the source of materials, knowledge, beauty and emotions.

---

[278] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. chp. sec. 1. (1888, 27).

6.1 6 Work to Play?

On the stage of reality Ruskin is aware of how powerful play and game are and within what type of work play occurs. Ruskin sets up a few opposiing pairs of notions: "work to play"[279], production to consumption, and head to hand, and sense to nose " types of work. By categorising modes of play he differentiates between classes who work and who play. He says, "You play. it amuses you, and it has no result but the amusement, all English games is making money [..] any roughest sport; and it is absolutely without purpose; no one who engages heartily in that game ever knows, why" (1898, 31). He sees clearly that there is a big difference between "winning money" and "making it"; " a great difference between getting it out of another man's pocket into ours, or filling both" (1898, 32). He also considers "ladies' dressing" a kind of earthly game which is not cheap but certainly a "pretty game". He says, "You ladies like to lead the fashion [...]. Dress yourself nicely, and dress everybody nicely". Ruskin suggests that ladies should "lead the fashion for the poor first; make them look well" (1898, 35). He includes war in the notion of work to play. He sees war "the whistling bullets-our love messengers between nations" (1898, 63) saying that "we dress for it, not merely in scarlet, as to hunt but in scarlet and gold, and all manner of fine colours, of course we could fight better in grey, and without feathers; but all nations have agreed that it is good to be well dressed at this play." (1898, 35). Naturally there are other games which should be played by each class of a society. These are, in his opinion, playing at literature as well as at art. Ruskin (1898) expands the notion of *play and game* in relation to *work* to ethical spheres emphasising honesty and justice. Within the scope of play Ruskin mentions two kinds of work: *'rough* and *gentle* work. He is convinced that everyone has to hold days honourable, or holy and constitute these days holy days by making them days of rest. Play, in this context, has the meaning of activities helping people to do something else than work: either it is rough or gentle. His point here is to suggest that we should differentiate between these two ends of work. It also

---

[279] To derive the notion of *play* from theorising about aesthetics is not a new tendency in the history of aesthetics, but naturally the meanings applied to it vary. I will mention here Schiller's (1967) concept of this subject. He says "man only plays when he is in the fullest sense of the word ..and he is only fully a human being when he plays.' Fifteenth Letter 8. It is play which, he remarks, " He thinks," The beauty we find in actual existence is precisely what the play-drive we find in actual existence deserves; but with the ideal of Beauty that is set up by Reason, an ideal of the play-drive, too, is enjoined upon man, which he must keep before his eyes in all his forms of play. Letter Fifteenth 7.

raises a serious ethical question as to who and what classes have to be condemned to do rough work. which, he says, "honourable or not, takes the life out of us; and the man who has been heaving clay out of a ditch all day. [...]..is not the same man at the end of his day, or might, as one, who has been sitting in a quiet room, with everything comfortable about him, reading books, or classing butterflies, or painting pictures" (1898, 49).

6.1.7 Mechanical Toil vs. Intelligent Work

The urge to make more and more money pushes taste and imagination aside. Intelligent work "is altogether individual; that is to say, that which any man does by means of it could never have been done by any other man"[280] is also substituted by machines.

This is the kind of work which questions creation; the ground of imagination. Therefore, Morris finds it crucial to develop *Imaginative Work* which mirrors "the whole of the artist's thought" unlike the work of the mechanical workman: "who does not note the difference between bright and dull in his colours, but only know them by numbers, [and who] is, while he is at his work, no man, but a machine" (1931, 119). Elsewhere, in relation to variety and intelligence, he says "artistic eagerness, would not be a burden, but an interest added to life quite apart from its necessity" (Morris 1994, 95). Morris believes that machinery has been the result of a "bargain between labour and art and the outcome is a makeshift" (1886, 87). Ruskin differentiates between 'living work and dead hand - work" (1849, 54), that is, real and machinery work". He observes, "machine work is bad as work; it is dishonest" (1849, 53):

6.1.8 Work Expressed in Architecture: "The manifestation of an admirable human intelligence"[281]

I will use the notion of architecture here as an example to show that it is

> firstly, one of the most important means of expressing beauty by work and labour as well as power[282] appearing in the architecture of a nation,

---

[280] Morris *The Prospects Of Architecture, in* Ball ed. (1931, 119).

secondly, the bearer and transmitter of thoughts, visions, skills and knowledge aiming to affect people's taste, values and sense of beauty.

Before dealing with this topic in depth it is important to highlight the reason for privileging to Architecture[283] out of many branches of art. The word is capitalised to indicate its meaning borrowed from Scott; that is, "a supreme control over all the elements of a design, with the right to arrange, to modify, to eliminate and to conventionalise (1914, 70). Morris's. line of thought explains why my choice has fallen on Architecture:

> if we did not know how to dye or to weave; if we had neither gold, nor silver, nor silk; and no pigments to paint with, but half-a-dozen ochres and umbres, we might yet frame worthy art that would lead to everything, if we had but timber, stone, and lime, and a few cutting tools to make these common things not only shelter us from wind and weather, but also express the thoughts and aspirations that stir in us [284].

Morris writes elsewhere that "all men that have left any signs of their existence behind them practised art" (1872, 84) and it is architecture[285] which leads us to all the arts. Rosenberg states, when examining the reasons for the Gothic Revival in Pugin's[286] and

---

[281] Ruskin 1886, 37 vol. 1. chp. 2.

[282] Besides the aesthetic power of architecture, which I emphasized earlier, here I also mean the political, ideological, cultural 'trends' built in the architecture of a given age.

[283] The impact of romanticism acquiring the prestige of Nature, writes Scott (1914), has affected the significance of Architecture. Traditional design and formal gardens disappear, styles are treated as symbols and "a romantic sense of history" starts focusing equally on Gothic and Greek styles. "The Greeks stood for reasons, civilisation, and calm." Gothic "Like Nature, it was intricate and strange; in detail realistic, in composition it was bold, accidental and irregular, like the composition of the physical world." (1914, 61). In his view "the creed of Nature entailed two consequences: first, a prejudice against Order and Proposition, and therefore against the Renaissance conveying monotony with little sculpture in it. It is considered conventional and artificial, shortly, 'unnatural.' Scott also thinks that there is a tendency which attaches 'domestic architecture' to no historic style but the farm-buildings as 'almost to form part of the Nature that surrounds them" (1914, 62).

[284] Morris, *The Prospect of Architecture, in* Ball ed., (1931, 111).

[285] In this context Morris uses architecture as a means of synthesising popular arts. In his view all these arts are the parts of the "great whole" that is, Architecture, in Ball ed , 1931, 111 "Architecture".

[286] As Rosenberg (1963) sees it, only when Pugin published his work "Contrasts" in 1836 were the principles of medieval buildings taken seriously. Pugin conceives of Gothic not a style but a way of life. According to Rosenberg, "three potent elements of romanticism meet and reinforce each other: a longing glance at an idealised past, a quickened religious consciousness, and a summary rejection of neo-classicism as devoid of humanity or sincerity" (1963:50).

Ruskin's arts, that architecture is considered "as the means of reshaping the national life" (1963, 52).

For Morris and Ruskin, particularly when the focus is on work and labour, architecture embodies power other than that of an institute, a state or a group of classes. Building up something in marble, iron etc. bestows the "exquisite sensation" on man to discover the evidence of the magnificent "struggle into independent existence". By learning to appreciate other nations' work and detect

> the borrowed thoughts, the finding of the actual blocks and stones covered by other hands and in other ages, wrought into the new walls, with a new expression and purpose given to them, like the blocks of unsubdued rocks. which we find in the heart of the lava current (Ruskin, 1886:152).

This may promote more patience and tolerance towards the values of previous cultures. Ruskin sees one aspect of power expressed by architecture "a kind of human sympathy, by a measure of darkness as great as there is in human life" (1849, 84). He also emphases that creation and "mightiness" are the most crucial features of architecture. He suggests that architecture is the

> lasting witness against men, in their quiet contrast with the traditional character of all things, .through the hope of reasons and times, and the decline and birth of dynasties, and the changing of the face of the earth, and the limits of the sea, [which] maintains its sculptured shapeliness for a time insuperable, connects forgotten and following ages with each other" (1849, 187).

He often associates architecture with life and 'living'. The reason for this, in his view, is that "There is sensation in every inch of it, and an accommodation to every architectural necessity, with a determined variation in arrangement, which is exactly like the related proportions and provisions in the structure of organic forms." (1849, 160). He associates the word 'living' [287] with architecture when "there is sensation in every inch of it, and an accommodation to every architectural necessity, with a determined variation in arrangement, which is exactly like the related proportions and provisions in the structure of organic form" (Ruskin 1849, 160). Man needs, he writes, the virtue of a building "through which he may show his affections and delights" (Ruskin 1886, 40). The "power of human mind" is the secret of human life within

[287] This word in Morris's wording often means 'pleasure'.

which architecture is one of the means of realising and expressing it. Ruskin classifies this power in the following way:

> the one characterised by an exceeding preciousness and delicacy, by which we recur with a sense of affectionate admiration,
>
> the other by a reverse, and, in many cases mysterious, majesty , which we remember with an undiminished awe, like that felt the presence and operation of some great Spiritual Power (1849, 70).

The work and labour invested in the process of building translate ideas, dreams and emotions into materials and constructions making man's life safer and more comfortable as well as preserving his talent, knowledge and sense of beauty, spiritual and intellectual wholeness: "cementing the society into a beautiful unit"[288] for future generations. Morris insists that architecture should reflect simplicity and solidity and witness the beauty of man's mind and hands. Ruskin shares Morris's devotion to architecture claiming that work expressed in architecture is the "performance of common and necessary work; and conformity with universal and divine conscious of loveliness"[289]. Routh points out that it is architecture which, in Ruskin's opinion, has always embodied a "deeper human significance", "the expression of qualities and aspirations neither past nor present, but universal and continuous" (1935, 72). Especially "Gothic typified the honour and sanctification of human labour" in Ruskin's words Gothic "unites fantasy and law, as well as for our immediate purpose" (1849:59). It is the power of mind, says Ruskin, realised by work in architecture which enables man to express "Strength or good construction" and "Beauty or good decoration" (1886, 37). Ruskin attributes two virtues to man's work expressed in architecture:

> firstly,." the signs of man's own good work
>
> secondly, the expression of man's delight in better work than his own"[290].

In his opinion national architecture has duties which naturally can be carried out by work. These duties are:

> "to render the architecture of the day, historical, and

---

[288] Richard L. Stein, *The Ritual Of Interpretation. The Time, Arts As Literature. Ruskin, Rossetti, And Pater* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard University Press, 1975), 85.

[289] Ruskin, 1886:43 vol. I. chp. II.

[290] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. chp. 2. (1886, 43).

to preserve, as the most precious of inheritances, that of the past ages" (1849, 178).

Both Morris and Ruskin claim that architecture combines and harmonises beauty and usefulness. To the question of how it is done Ruskin offers the answer when analysing the construction of a bridge, which manifests intelligence, depth of thoughts and mental power " [..] not muscular, nor mechanical, nor technical, nor empirical- pure, precious, majestic, massy intellect"[291]. He says that the intellect through work is capable of building a bridge which in its complexity is not purely the outcome of creation making it possible to carry man across a river thus, in this sense useful, but the virtues man's work hasused in a construction like a bridge are also the bearer of delights and affections evoked by feeling the beauty of creation and that of decoration. To make this line of thought clearer it is worth quoting Ruskin's own words:

> the man [building a bridge] chose a curve and numbered the stones, had to know the times and tides of the river, and the strength of its floods, and the heights and flow of them, and the soil of the banks [ ]and in the choice of the curve and numbering of stones are expressed not only his knowledge of these, but such ingenuity and firmness as he had, in applying special means to overcome the special difficulties about this bridge [ ]you need that virtue of building through which he may show his affections and delights; you need its beauty" (1886, 39-40).

He also stresses that though the workman's work may be imperfect, "his thoughts and affections may be true and deep" (38). Morris and Ruskin view architecture as one of the most crucial ways of making art, through work and labour being responsive to Nature's harmony, fantasy, perfection and her beauty. In this respect, ornaments carved and formed into various materials express and interpret both the mysterious power of Nature and that of man's mind and hands[292]. Work makes it possible for Nature's patterns, curves, colours and shapes to appear in buildings, houses and constructions through the media of architecture which is "to place her most exuberant vegetable ornament just where Nature would have placed it, and to give some indication of that radical and connected structure which nature would have given it" (Ruskin 1849, 108).

---

[291] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1. chp 2. (1886, 39).

[292] Power here involves the emotions evoked by the ornaments which architecture has made it possible to ' verbalise' in pieces of stone, marble, iron or wood.

But unlike Nature's work, says Ruskin, man's work has built "like frogs and mice since the thirteenth century" (1849, 101). He criticises domestic architecture of modern work because of "its petty neatness" bearing the signs of poor and miserable work.

In Ruskin's complex dealings with work it is architecture which embodies several meanings of human 'mind and hands'. He observes that besides the work expressed in modern architecture the "domestic one" is also the bearer of "a strange sense of formalised deformity, or shrivelled precision, of starved accuracy, of minute misanthropy" (1849, 101). His main point here is that man should become aware that the power of work and labour also lies in producing ugly things such as "the pitiful little pigeon-holes which stand for doors in the East front of Salisbury, looking like the entrances to a beehive or a wasp's nest [...]". The power[293] which brought about careless work forwards a number of messages to generations. Morris and Ruskin pose the question as to what exactly this power may entail. They think that people accepting and being satisfied with a 'beehive type of work' will not be able to appreciate and teach beauty, and architects being allowed to produce such work cannot be expected ".to conceive and deal with breadth and solidity" (Ruskin 1849, 101), this work will instead reproduce the same ugliness again. What they emphasise is that by work man has been enabled not only to create but also to destroy: "cut down the pleasant trees among the houses, pull down ancient and venerable buildings for the money that a few square yards of London dirt will fetch; blacken rivers, hide the sun and poison the air with smoke and worse, and it's nobody's business to see it or mend it[294]. Clearly this is not the kind of work either Morris or Ruskin would like to characterise man's 'mind and hands', though its power cannot be denied. It does exist, it does have its impact on Nature, on Man's life, health and mentality. Both Morris and Ruskin also face a significant challenge deciding how to treat the question of a man being a genius and his relationship with work. Only a few people can be considered genii to whom work may convey different meanings and values. Ruskin thinks that "a man of genius is always far more ready to work than other people, and gets so much more good from work that he is often so little conscious of the inherent divinity in himself, that he is very apt to ascribe all his capacity to his work, and to tell those who ask how he came

---

[293] In this context I use the word power, instead of e.g. influence, in the sense that this kind of work can determine future generations' sense of beauty and views of quality for decades and even for centuries.

[294] Morris *The Lesser Arts*, in Briggs ed. (1962, 102-103).

to be what he is: 'If I am anything, which I much doubt, I made myself so merely by labour" (1885, 245-246).

So far I have emphasised the notion of power by,

firstly, suggesting that Morris' and Ruskin's concepts of art and beauty attach meanings to work and labour which open new perspectives for viewing and understanding social, economic, moral and cultural problems

secondly, the effectiveness of producing ugliness

Now I will shift the question of work and labour to Morris' and Ruskin's ethical conceptions in the contexts of their aesthetics.

Chapter 7 Ethics Through Aesthetics

In this chapter I will attempt to examine some ethical aspects of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics in the light of *work and labour* through which, later, I will to transfer attention to the question of how they viewed their 'aesthetic ethics' work in practice. I will take examples from the sphere of architecture. As a way of exploring Morris' and Ruskin's ethics derived from aesthetics it is necessary, first, to reflect briefly on the notion of ethics[295], then to highlight and discuss the content and the meanings of their aesthetic ethics which, in my view, significantly contribute to the empowerment of their aesthetics. It is necessary to emphasise that I will limit my consideration only to a few ethical questions in relation to *work and labour* such as goodness, quality, truth, falsity, virtue, usefulness and criticism, which I have found the main and most characteristic qualities of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics and not to the whole construction and philosophy of their ethics. I will also apply Sinfield's (1989) Fiske's (1996) views, the details of which are offered in Chapter IV, when trying to 'trace' the phases of the empowerment of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics. That is, we should get acquainted with the 'genres' of a piece of art before trying to understand the meanings of the unity of its smaller parts as well as the "way of living. that encompasses all the meanings of the social experience" (Fiske 1996, 115).

---

[295] My aim here is not to offer either definitions or views on classifications of *ethics and morals*. I intend to focus only on Morris' and Ruskin's ethical views. I will bear Bernard Williams' opinion in mind claiming that 'ethical' is vague and it develops in a special notion of *obligation*. It is *'morality'* which offers sharp boundaries of the senses of 'morals' and 'non-morals' (1985, 93). Houghton (1957, 1630-1870) details and analyses in depth Victorian morals such as anxiety, commercial spirit and love.

In Bernard Williams' opinion "An ethical theory is a theoretical account of what ethical thought and practice are [it] either implies a general test for the correctness of basic ethical beliefs and principles or else implies that there cannot be such a test" (1985, 72). He goes on to write, "ethical experience can cover many things. These could be a way of doing moral philosophy that started from the ways in which we experience our ethical life. Such a philosophy would reflect on what we believe, feel, take for granted, the ways in which we confront obligation and recognise responsibility, the sentiments of guilt and shame" (1985, 72). In my opinion, the notion of ethics not only covers what is ethical and what is not, but also implies the whole structure of our relationships and patterns of behaviours. The concept of ethics involves issues of the conscience and the mind, not only the ones 'prescribed' and imposed on men by a society. Each man, in my opinion, to some degree formulates his own ethics which reflect his emotional world, but primarily 'man-made' laws set the ethical patterns for the whole society. The laws of ethics are either tacitly accepted or controlled and regulated by institutions. Laws use facts and experience but ethics goes beyond these; its focus is on how we should behave and say things. In this respect, in my view, ethics is closely related to aesthetics, as *behaviour* has or should have *aesthetic forms.*

At this point I would like to begin examining the ethical qualities of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics in terms of *work and labour.* What I want to emphasise here is their most crucial thought, that is, whatever we produce and create should be aesthetic[296] which determines our attitudes toward the world and our work. In other words, not only should the outcome of our work be aesthetic, but also our language and behaviour while working. By letting ourselves be led by our sense of beauty we may become more sensitive to the work of others and develop our own. John Rosenberg points out when analysing Ruskin's interpretation of Venetian history that "the art of a nation is an accurate index of its moral temper and this moral temper, more than anything else, determines its fate" (1963, 87). Ruskin's and Morris' aesthetic concepts of *goodness, blessedness*[297], *happiness*[298] *truth and virtue* bring serious ethical questions into their way of seeing the process and the outcome of *work*

---

[296] See chapter 4 for what set of meanings their aesthetics employ.

[297] Not in the Carlylean (1843) sense, but that of possessing knowledge, skills, abilities and talent to create.

[298] Chapter 6 looks at closely what meanings these notions employ in Morris' and Ruskin's arts.

and labour. Ruskin contemplating on the types of *goodness* required in work concludes that there are two aspects of *goodness*. One of them is:

> man should do his "practical duty" well and
>
> the other is the process of doing which should be "graceful and pleasing" (1886:35).

Good work " clever or learned, or difficult in the doing" by one of Ruskin's (1886, 77) definitions, is not, for example, a Turner landscape, that may express "delight in the perpetual contemplation of a good and perfect thing. That is an entirely moral quality- it is the taste of the angels. And all delight in fine art, and all love of it, resolve themselves into simple love of that which deserves love" (77) .there, is your chief duty, you workmen and tradesmen- to be true to yourselves and to us who would help you (61). For Ruskin one level of *virtue* is represented by architecture. He says, virtue is "the signs of man's own work" and "the expression of man's delight in better work than his own" (1886, 43). He directly relates the 'impressions of beauty" to morals He observes, young men learning to paint throughout their training " in all they paint they shall see and feel the noblest things"[299]. The question of the conditions of work is not only a social or a political one for them, but also of ethics. Ruskin considers it an injustice in a society if one class "should do or divide, the work of the other" (1898, 86) and the work of one class that maintains the whole society. Morris claims, "Instead of huddled make shifts, bare, sunless, grim bastilles. [...] homes for the workers should be tall blocks [...] but that need not prevent ample room in each lodging, so as to include such comforts of space, air and privacy as every moderately – living middle-class family considers itself entitled to; also [...] a garden space round each block...It would be natural to have covered walking or playing places." (1994, 51-52). In his wording *wise and useful* are closely related to each other. *Wise* work should be done which is at the same time also *useful*. As, Ruskin explains, "when work comes to nothing; when all our bees' business turns to spider's and for honey-comb we have only resultant cobweb, blown away by the next breeze" (1898, 62). Dealing with environmental problems of how Nature and, thus, her beauty can drastically be affected by man's *work and labour* when designing 'awkward', tasteless, ugly buildings and placing them where their ugliness is emphasised by the perfect shapes, colours and patterns of Nature, Ruskin reminds us to be more humble and modest so as

---

[299] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 2. chp. 2. (1888, 11).

to be able to appreciate what it is "to live in a cottage with a deal floor and roof. [...], in many respects healthier and happier than living between a Turkey carpet and gilded ceiling, beside a steel grate and polished fender" (1898, 86).What he thinks about *work* and *justice* is also worth mentioning. He says, "charity is greater than justice. Yes, it is greater; it is the summit of justice-it is the temple of which justice is the fountain." (1898, 54). The fascinating part of Ruskin's ethical concept within the realm of his aesthetics is the recognition of the ethical consequences of *criticism* in relation to *quality* of *work and labour*. Ruskin writes, "with which you the public, receive the works of the young men submitted to you. You may do much harm by indiscreet praise and by indiscreet blame." (1907, 27). What he thinks is that the right kind of criticism help to develop 'healthy' self-criticism which neither an artist nor a craftsmen can be devoid of. Criticism may also reveal bad quality of both work and material.[300].The reflections of Morris and Ruskin on *quality*[301] regarding the production of art and a "useful piece of work" as well as the process of creation also relate aesthetics to ethics. In my view, the ethical side of quality in their aesthetics is that quality reflects both physical and mental workers' ethics; their beliefs, values and attitudes and that of a society in which work is done according to the criteria of quality accepted and used by the members and groups of that specific society. What is worth showing in Ruskin's and Morris' arts in terms of quality within their aesthetics is that that it is connected with *success and material* which lead them to discuss ethical issues such as desire to produce beauty and high quality in useful work [302]. Ruskin suggests that we should not decorate our roofs with wretched, half -worked, blunt-edged rosettes; we should not let us flank our gates with rigid imagination of medieval statuary"[303]. He also remarks, "the values of appearance is important"(184) and labour should be represented by materials of value. Both Morris and Ruskin think, without quality man cannot consider

---

[300] I view the notion of *material* in Morris's and Ruskin's aesthetics and ethics in the following way: things and means that man can work with. This material is either

1. the outcome of man's physical and spiritual work or
2. the productions and the 'gifts' of Nature.

The outcome of the relationship between work and material is the knowledge, emotions and beauty realised and expressed in new material forms.

[301] I will look at another crucial aspect of the notion of quality in chapter 8.

[302] I will investigate the educative aspect of the question in chapter 8.

[303] Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture.*, in Joan Evans ed. (1959, 183).

his work successful. In Morris's[304] opinion we need to experience successful labour which primarily entails producing and experiencing quality to be able to learn and overcome the hardships of existence. Thus, labour can be called successful if it reflects the craftsman's soul, talent and knowledge. Morris suggests in relation to Decorative Art[305] that "ornamental workmanship" should be excellent in all things instead of having a low average standard of work. The remedy can be found in the work of handicraftsmen "who have no call to be greedy and isolated like the manufacturers or middlemen; the duty and honour of educating the public lies with them"(Morris 1961, 101). Ruskin observes, one major condition for producing beauty is the question of how we work. The only chance for man to produce beauty and perfection similar to those of Nature[306] is high quality of *work and labour* in whatever minute 'particle' it is done in the whole process. It is relevant here to quote Ruskin's views of the quality of man's work expressed in architecture in comparison to that produced and offered by Nature.

> there is not a cluster of weeds growing in any cranny of ruin which has not a beauty in all respects nearly equal, and, in some, immeasurably superior, to that of the most elaborate sculpture of its stone [..] and that all our interest in the carved work, our sense of its richness, though it is tenfold less rich than the knots of grass beside it; of its delicacy, though it is a thousandfold less delicate; [..] results from our consciousness of its being the work of poor, clumsy, toilsome man" (1849, 53).

He also thinks that if "all the steps marked most clearly in the arts, and in Architecture"[307] then poor quality will significantly affect generations' sense of beauty. He is convinced, "The life of a nation is usually, like the flow of a lava stream. first bright and fierce, then languid and covered, at last advancing only by the tumbling over and over of frozen blocks" (1849,150). These "frozen blocks" will reveal what beliefs, practices and values[308] are attached to *work and labour*. Ruskin considers these

---

[304] Morris, *Lesser Arts,* in Briggs ed. (1962, 101).

[305] I looked at few aspects of this notion in chapter 4.

[306] Details are also given in chapter 6.

[307] Ruskin (1849, 150).

[308] Y this I mean what Morris and Ruskin thinks of arts, that is, they "are the expression of the value of life, and also the production of them makes his life of value" (in Thompson, 1955:656).

to be "*violation of truth*"[309] in architecture, if there comes "a direct falsity of assertion respecting the nature of material, or the quality of labour" (1849, 33). Similarly, the notion of *fault* is often dwelt on by Morris and Ruskin. For Ruskin there is no 'falsity' which is less harmless than the other. He suggests, we should cast them all aside as "they may be light and accidental; but they are an ugly root from the smoke of the pit, [..] and it is better that our hearts should be swept clean of them, without over care as to which is largest or blackest" (1849, 31). Looking deeper into the question of the *lie* Ruskin observes, "It is the glistening and the softly spoken lie; the amiable fallacy; the patriotic lies of the historian, the provident lie of the politician, the zealous lie of the partizan, the merciful lie of the friend, and the careless lie of each man to himself, the cast that black mystery over humanity" (1849, 30). There is still an important ethical point in Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics, which, I think, worth reflecting on. And, this is our ability to "kill beauty", ruining deliberately and destroying art and beauty because of lack of knowledge, sensitivity and certain feelings and emotions. Against the practice of a society where human *work and labour* often give preference to money vs. beauty some ethical principles are brought about by their reflections on how to avoid killing beauty; "its freshness and purity" (Ruskin 1849, 118). Both artists attribute this phenomenon to the lifestyle imposed on people by industrialisation and to the ignorance of education as well as lack of sense of beauty at all levels of our lives. Besides all these Ruskin's sensitivity makes him observe that one of the reasons for man's 'killing beauty' is that whatever beautiful thought or expression is continually repeated will be ineffective and "will have its sharpness and clearness destroyed forever" if it is offered to the mind when it is disturbed and "the eye cannot help it into work" (1849, 118). Their principles in relation to producing ugliness and ruining beauty by work and labour find a place also in architecture. Ruskin writes,

> The fact is, that hills are not so high as we fancy them, and, when to the actual impression of no mean comparative size, is added the sense of the toil of manly

[309] Truth in their arts mainly means to be true to nature and the transmission of her truths into earthly life. Ruskin. thought that man is a "double creature" which is also expressed in Architecture as he "has a true and false faith. He has a true and a false hope, a true and a false charity, and, finally, a true and a false life" He says that man's true life is like that of lower organic beings, the independent force by which he moulds and governs external things; it is a force of assimilation which connects everything around him into food, or into instruments and which however humbly or obediently it may listen to or follow the guidance of superior intelligence, never forfeits its own authority as a judging principle, as a will capable either of obeying or rebelling." ("The Lamp Of Life" 1849, 148). .Ruskin's contemporaries such as Matthew Arnold considers Truth primarily what is said by the Bible, that is, the "righteousness tendeth to life" (1968:195, Prov. xi.19).

hand and thought, a sublimity is reached, which nothing but gross error in arrangement of its parts can destroy (1849, 74).

He observes elsewhere, "there is not a moment throughout Europe that speaks of old years and mighty people, but it is being swept away to build cafés .and destroy without a thought all those labours which men have given their lives and their sons' lives to complete[310]. Sadly he acknowledges "how much oftener man destroys natural sublimity, than nature crushes human power" (1849, 73).

In what follows, I will try to sum up how I view the role of ethics in empowering Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics so that the principles and values of their aesthetic ethics will not remain 'pure' theories, but are practised through education, thus affecting the whole culture.

Chapter 8. Educating "Spiritual and Moral Creatures"[311]

My aim by directing attention to education in this chapter and its relationship with hegemony is to examine in what points Morris and Ruskin's aesthetics affects their views of practice in relation to work and labour. Within the modern debate about this relationship and its ideological functions I want to show the way I conceive the power of Morris's and Ruskin's educative ethics functioning from and within their aesthetics.

The eighteenth century confidence in the reasoning power of man was gradually replaced by uncertainty and in this process cease religion to be man's safe 'refuge' and the source of answers to hardships. Nothing could illustrate the doubts of a thinker better than Shelley's beautiful lines "We are on that verge where words abandon us, and what wonder if we grow dizzy to look down the dark abyss of how little we know"[312]. Matthew Arnold who also worked as an inspector would like to have lived in a society where "life itself consists [..].in the effort to affirm one's own essence, to develop one's own existence fully and freely, to have ample light and air; to be neither

---

[310] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 2. part 3, sec. 1.(1888: 5).

[311] Ruskin, (1849, 370).

[312] Ruskin (1849, 370).

[312] Percy Bysshe. Shelley, "On Life." *Selected Poetry and Prose*, ed. , Neil Cameron (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1951) 22.

cramped nor overshadowed"[313]. He firmly believed that man could be equipped with "sweetness and light" (beauty and intelligence) only by education, and this man "is full of antipathy against the rougher or coarser movements going around him, that he will not lend a hand to be humble operation of uprooting evil by their means" (49). Knowing that the new generation of experts[314] in the nineteenth century, for example, Rosebuck, Radical MP for Bath, and Sir Thomas Wyse, who published Education Reform in 1836, aimed to adjust the British education system to changes[315] as well as to better the morality and intellect of the nation the following questions arise :

1. was English education ready to let new ideas and practices be applied, and
2. was it open for all the "creative creatures" of the nation as Ruskin and Morris would have liked it to be ?

Altick (1974) makes it clear that the Victorian age used education to get the nation to believe that by technological and scientific development no-one should be excluded from gaining knowledge which would help the nation to profit from it. Early in the nineteenth century the great demand for education led to the opening of, for example, the London University: in 1828 and in 1831 the Anglican College, King's College London. It is worth quoting Joan Burstin's views on the development of schooling.

> Such an emphasis on schooling could have developed only in a society-like that of England in the nineteenth century, where many families could afford to dispense with the labour of their children [..]. The *middle-classes* knew society

---

[313] Matthew Arnold, *Democratic Education* (R.H. Super ed. The University of Michigan, 1962), 7.

[314] Their programme emphasized the establishment of state run-schools, the importance of training a new generation of teachers and inspectors.

[315] Out of many cultural changes I would like to focus on one specific feature which has affected education in depth, namely 'literacy'. Writing and reading are no longer the privilege of the ruling classes. The working classes have also become the target of mass publications. By examining the growing significance of English literature in education in the nineteenth-century I will use Terry Eagleton's view 1983).He thinks that the reason for the rise of English is "Like religion, literature works primarily by emotions and experience, and so was well fitted to carry through the ideological task which religion left off" (1983, 25). To avoid lengthy discussion I will highlight his concepts in three major points.:
1. religion is losing its power and ceases "to provide the 'social cement'. .by which a socially turbulent class- society can be welded together" (23-24)
2. it is English literature as a " liberal, 'humanising pursuit' (that) could provide a potent antidote to political bigotry and ideological extremism" (25)
England in the era of high imperialism needed powerful means against her younger German and American rivals and one of these means was, "the academic establishment of .English" (25). By English literature the previously gender-biased English education started to change. Learning became available for women too as getting acquainted with "fine feelings and thoughts" seemed harmless

would reward individual effort, and they came to believe that school should prepare and examinations select successful individuals (1980, 18).

Burstin also observes that lower-middle class parents were anxious to send their sons to schools where "marketable skills" were taught, and goes on to say "the Victorians saw education as a means of both social and individual betterment. The two elements existed side by side, but social control was emphasised in the education of the lower classes" (11). Altick thinks that only few working-class children had the chance to spend more than three years at school. But, Burstin (1980) remarks, later in the century bright lower-class students did have the chance for self-development through further schooling. At this point I would like to draw attention to, in Richard Johnson's opinion, that working people were considered as a "problem, often in the policy-making context" [316]. He observes (89) that the experts' aim was to transform the belief and behaviour of working classes and in this process state schooling was considered the main form of educating and civilising. For them it became evident that without education which would set up models and programmes for useful leisure. At the same time the schooling of the_nobility and gentry did not change too much since Tudor times, says Altick.. Children of these classes, especially boys[317] were sent to one of the nine ancient public schools headed by Eton. In Morris' view what was thought to be "the higher education" was nothing but "a system of compromises [giving] way to the pressure of commercial existences, and determined apparently to destroy"[318]. Education was based on the traditional curriculum; translation, memorising and passing works of classical authors. Martin J. Wiener[319] emphasises that public schools, mainly open to the upper- and upper-middle classes, initiated changes as long as they did not affect the traditional pattern. He writes, "there was a fear of science as antireligious [..] and an association of science with vulgar industry, artisans and commercial utility "(18). Thomas Carlyle

---

[316] Richard Johnson, "Educating The Educators:'Experts' And The State 1833-9",. in A.P. Donajgrodzki ed., *Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britaiin* (London: Croom Helm, 1977). 72.

[317] Girls "were largely unprovided for except in finishing schools of demonstrable futility" (Altick 1974, 252). The gender-biased nature of the Victorian education is also shown by Ruskin's way of seeing women's education in his book, *Sesame and Lilies Three Lectures.* he remarks, "A woman, in any rank of life, ought to know whatever her husband is likely to know, but to know it in a different way. His command of it should be foundational and progressive, hers, general and accomplished for daily and helpful use" (1895, 17).

[318] Morris, *Signs Of Change. The Aims of Art* (1970), 85.

[319] Martin J. Wiener, *English Culture And The Decline Of The Industrial Spirit 1850-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

came forward with a demand for compulsory universal and general education which should be the task of the state. 'Regarding the responsibility of the state Ruskin said, "In order that men may be able to support themselves when they are grown, their strength must be properly developed while they are young, the state should always see to this-not allowing their health to be broken by too early labour; nor their powers to be wanted for want of knowledge" (Ruskin 1907:139). The peasant -born Carlyle was aware of what thanks he owned to knowledge. His key concepts were, as Frederick Roe summarises them: "To impart the gift of thinking to those who could think [...]. The workers must themselves be educated to the extent of their capacity, so that their knowledge and energy might be contributed collectively to the solution of great problems" (Roe 1921, 113-114). Learning facts and improving useful knowledge was the main aim of practice, writes Altick (1974). This practice was criticised by Thomas Huxley wrote, "You know well enough that it is something to write a history of chairs in general [..] and quite another thing to make with your own hands a veritable chair, that will stand fair and square"[320] "but at school, college you shall know of no source of truth but authority" (96). Matthew Arnold suggested, "What, however, we can all do in our measure, is to set ourselves against having our schools and their system governed by clap-trap of any kind- educational clap-trap, or political clap-trap, or politico-religious clap-trap" (1870, 88). He goes on analysing the system by writing: "let us not deceive ourselves; the science of teaching is still in its infancy, the right programme of studies has yet to be discovered. Give your pupils a whole of some important kind for their thoughts to crystallise around." (88)

In my view, what Morris and Ruskin emphasised is that art and beauty influence education so that it will meet the requirements of the new cultural, social and economic changes. Therefore, to make education less 'police-like' (Johnson 89) and allow people to exploit their abilities and talent not only man-made laws were needed, but also the principles and theories of beauty and art. These ideas were formulated in the nineteenth century, for example, by Matthew Arnold, Thomas Carlyle, and John Stuart Mill, but it was William Morris and John Ruskin who build their concepts of aesthetics, ethics and education into a whole complex system whose main point was to understand man's role in nature and the objectives of work and labour in producing beauty without considering of what class man belongs to. They thought, to achieve these aims a nation not only

[320] Thomas Huxley, *Science And Education* (London: Macmillan, 1893 vol. 3), 107

needs Turners, but each 'drop' of talent should be recognised and supported. It is education, they say, that makes us experience and become aware of what *beauty, art and 'excellence'*[321] are. Ruskin claims that "the cultivation of sensibility and judgement" require experience and learning. Morris could imagine learning only within "liberal education" and opportunities in which everyone would have his "share whatever knowledge there is in the world according to [his] capacity or best of his mind"[322]. He was convinced that future generations would be creative workers and thinkers only if they were encouraged to "play in the woods for weeks together [to] learn to do things for themselves, and get to notice the wild creatures; and you see, the less they stew in houses the better for them. [..] it gives them a little rough work" (1970, 207). For him

> it is too bold to hope that in a state of society to which a class of drudgers is no longer necessary, education will not only be universal, but will be both liberal and wiser for all, than it is to-day for a few; and that it will be its function to develop (sic) any gifts which children or older people may have towards science, literature, the handicrafts, or the higher arts"[323]

Elsewhere, he details the type of education in the form of a "socially ordered community" in which people should participate in. Instead of pushing and directing people

> to take their places in the hierarchy of commerce" [he thinks] "young people would be taught such handicrafts as they had a turn for as a part of their education, the discipline of their minds and bodies; and adults would also have opportunities of learning for the development of individual capacities would be of all things chiefly aimed at by education [324].

He believed that the system would work well if children were taught to swim, cook and explore their environment, giving opportunities for them to enquire, meet children from other cultures whose language they could learn easily while playing together. If "book. Students" grow up they are "so happy over work [..] these students are generally such

---

[321] Ruskin claimed that "the thing to which it is applied required a great power for its production" vol. 1. chp. 2 (1888, 14). man had to practice and learn to enhance his knowledge, to feel and distinguish what excellence is.

[322] Morris, *The Necessities Of Life*, in Ball ed. (1931, 124).

[323] *Morris Political Writings. William Morris Justice, vol.1, November 15, 1884, o.4i (1994, 30).*

[324] Morris *Signs of Change. Useful Work v. Useless Toil.* In Ball ed. (1931, 132).

pleasant people; so kind and sweet-tempered; so humble, and at the same time so anxious to teach everybody all that they know"[325] He also believed that "A superstition still remains from the times when 'education' was a rarity that is a means for earning a superior livelihood but as soon as it has ceased to be a rarity, competition takes care that education shall be worth just no more than a tolerable return on the money and time spent acquiring it"[326]. Both Morris and Ruskin are convinced that *work and labour* would not serve as a means of developing a sense of beauty, happiness, excellence, knowledge, wisdom and usefulness unless each member of the society had the chance to experience *art and beauty* and through them *creation* whatever work man does. They said that if work was done it should be done so that it would reflect mental and physical work of high quality, thinking and emotions by allowing the worker to experience,

to have time to do "finish"[327]

to perceive beauty

to discover

If a nation is concentrating on how money should serve it well-being and by careless work it destroys the beauty of Man's and Nature's work and will deprive future generations of feeling happiness over their ancestor's creations. Morris blamed the whole society for allowing vulgarity in their homes by writing, "stupidity goes through all classes of society: the silk curtains in my lord's drawing-room are no master of art to him than the power in his footman's hair; the kitchen in a country farmhouse is most commonly a pleasant and homelike place, the parlour dreary and useless" (1962, 102). John Ruskin employed the term of *school of trial* saying that practice " must not be entirely regulated by formal laws of art education, but must ultimately be the workshop of a good matter painter, who will try the lads with one kind of art or another, till he finds out what they are fit for" (1907, 25). He observed,

> the full service to make, in the noble sense of the world, gentlemen[328] of them, to take care that their [future painters] minds receive such training, that in all they paint they shall see and feel the noblest things [..] and even where the natural

---

[325] Morris, Signs of Change (1970, 211).

[326] Morris, *Hopes and Fears for Art*, in Briggs ed. (1962, 146).

[327] Ruskin details what "finish" means in his work: *Modern Painters* vol 2. chp. 6. (Kent: George Allen, 1888).

[328] Houghton (1957) speaks about what it meant being a gentleman in the nineteenth century.

taste and feeling of the youth have been pure and true, where there was the right staff in him to make a gentleman " (30).

Morris thought "continued practice will help a man who is naturally a designer, continual notice of nature and of art"[329] and man should not be left alone in this practice. If social and economic reasons do not allow drawing and making and carving beautiful ornaments and "if the world is too busy to allow us to have Decorative Art at all, [then what can help us is] general cultivation of the power of the mind, [and] general cultivation of the eye and hand" (Morris 1962, 99-100). Ruskin (1907) pointed out, that we should learn and teach new generations to appreciate the work of great masters of earlier centuries, their work in which they put their heart and soul. We should keep their work and avoid breaking and melting them because they are considered old fashioned. What Ruskin thought of education in *art and beauty* can be clearly seen by the following learning stages which he offers when teaching design:

> to design all things at first in severe abstraction, and be prepared, if need were,
> to carry them out in that form, then
> to mark the parts where high finish would be admissible,
> to complete these always with stern reference to their general effect, and then comment them by a graduated scale of abstraction with the rest [..] Never imitate anything but natural forms, and those the noblest, in the completed parts (Ruskin 1849, 135-136).

In Ruskin's view one way of educating healthy creative, working men is to bear in our mind

> that the first character of right childhood is that is modest...to perceive that there are many above him wiser than he [the child]; and to be always asking questions, wanting to learn, not to teach.
> the second character of right childhood is to be faithful. Perceiving that its father knows best what is good for it...And there is the true character of all good men also, as obedient workers, or soldiers under captain.
> the third character of a right childhood is to be loving. Give a little love to a child, and you get a great deal back. (1898, 66-67).

Ruskin posed the question whether a society should educate a *"man or a grindstone"*. The answer seemingly is evident. But from whose points of view? An artist, in his

---

[329] Morris *Neglect of Art.* In Briggs ed. (1962, 99).

opinion, approaches this question by taking all the human issues into consideration as well as the professional ones. While people whose interest is to make their financial power stronger will never reckon with such questions as humanity, beauty and art. For them educating 'grindstones' is the safe way to maintain their power. In Ruskin's view, when analysing the relationship between finish and the varied forms: "If the workman is thinking about the edges, he cannot be thinking of his design: if his design, he cannot think of his edges"[330]. His concern was to make both artists and craftsmen and teachers of arts and crafts aware that "the spirit of touch of the man who is inventing, and of the man who is obeying directions, is often all the difference between original and second-hand work of art"[331]. He also claims that a society should not want "one man to be always thinking, and another to be always working" (1959, 238) thus, dividing up the society between gentlemen and "operatives".

Both Ruskin and Morris considered one of the main duties of their lives was to publish their theories, deliver lectures and teach people how to implement the principles of aesthetics in terms of both man's work and that of Nature so that it would serve their personal and professional development in harmony with Nature's laws. In a broader sense, they wanted people to understand and participate emotionally and experience art by their work and labour as fully as possible. Ruskin writes, "No teacher can truly promote the cause of education until he knows the mode of life for which that education is to prepare his pupil" (1898, 25). He summarised his views of education as follows:

> And the entire object of the true education is to make people not merely *do* the right things, but *enjoy* the right things
> -not merely industrious, but to love industry
> -not merely learned, but to love knowledge
> not merely pure, but to love purity
> not merely just, but hunger and thirst after justice (Ruskin 1898, 76).

This inquiry into Morris' and Ruskin's ethical and moral concepts embedded in their aesthetics has led me to sum up their aims and objectives regarding practice in the following points:

---

[330] Ruskin , *The Stones of Venice*. "The Nature of Gothic" in Evans ed. (1959, :236-237).

[331] Ruskin in Evans ed. (1959, 236-237).

1. to teach each member of the nation to help not only in distress but help should also mean "guidance therefore, interference with liberty.." (Ruskin 1907, 138).to use art as a means of knowing.
2. to live "aesthetically"[332]
3. to give opportunity for people to become aware of that "work is only done well when it is done with a will; and no man has a thoroughly sound will unless he knows he is doing what he should and is in his place. (Ruskin 1898, 51).
4. to develop and cultivate taste, sensibility and judgement enabling man to "perceive excellence"[333]7 to enhance "intellectual beauty" as "All our morals are so interwoven with our intellectual powers, that we cannot affect the one without in some degree addressing the other"[334].
5. to be able to recognise "happy accidents"(Ruskin 1907, 130) that there are talents, like Giottos, among us. God sends hundreds of men, able to create art and if we think that there are no such men in our world it does not mean that God did not want to offer such 'gifts' to us, but "we have rejected them or crushed them".(Ruskin 1937,.131)
6. to produce quality of work "..how much we are to do, but of how it is to be done; it is not a question of doing more, but of doing better."[335]
7. to fit people's work to their capacities (Morris 1994, 95)
8. to educate "thinkers to be working and workmen to be thinking (Ruskin 1959, 237)
9. to help people becoming aware that man's "mind is always far in advance of his powers of execution"(Ruskin 1959,238)

Ruskin put four conditions forward to be considered when producing art:

1. how to get your man of genius
2. how to employ your man of genius
3. how to accumulate and preserve his work
4. how to distribute his work to the best national advantages (1907, 22-23).

---

[332] I have applied Eagleton's term (1990, 36).

[333] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1, chp. 2. (1888, 14).

[334] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 1, chp. 2. (1888, 26).

[335] Ruskin, *The Lamp Of Beauty*, in Evans ed. (1959, 183).

The following example shows to what extent Ruskin was sensitive to every little detail of life regarding his aims

> when a peasant mother sees one of her careless children fill into a ditch, her first proceeding is to pull him out: her second, to box his ears: her third, ordinarily, to lead him carefully a little way by the hand...if he understood any of the terms of politics, would certainly express resentment at the inference with his individual liberty; but the mother has done her duty (Ruskin 1907, 138).

What follows now is the question as to whether Morris' and Ruskin's views of education within the realm of aesthetics can have any affect in changing people's attitude toward their and others' work and labour and "better" the whole society. In Williams' (1980, 29) opinion, one way of understanding the structure of a dominant culture and the processes around which it organises itself so that it can emphasise its social, political and economic importance is to look at the modes supporting dominance. One of the main agencies, says Williams, in transmitting and maintaining power is education. He expands the question of power from education to "a much wider social training within institutions like the family; the practical definitions and organisation of work; the selective tradition at an intellectual level" (1980, 39) and emphasises that possessing all these, not only education reproduce an effective dominant culture. Shiach (1989, 16) when reflecting on Bourdieu's (1977) perceptions about the relation between "cultural capital" and "the possession of wealth and power". remarks that there are cultural forms and practices that have privileges by being institutionalised through education. Merely possessing these forms secures "social dominance" Morris and Ruskin do not go as far as claiming and advocating social dominance by education. If they think of dominance they primarily mean the impact of art and beauty on the society. Naturally they are aware of what power education and schooling, especially "the teaching of the minds"[336] may represent. Gramsci (1971) by examining the structures of schools arrives at seeing the 'power' of "school activities", first, in their "career bureaucracy"[337] and that of "rhetorical" or "intellectual work" struggling against the habits of dilettantism. He suggests setting up "creative

---

[336] Morris, *News From Nowhere* James Redmond ed. (London and New York: Routledge, 1890) 209.

[337] By this he means "the oligarchic traditional school equipped with power to be able to control the democratic regimes and parliaments (1971, 27).

schools"[338] by which there will be a chance to break the power of education serving the privileges of ruling classes. He lays stress on human work, "theoretical and practical activities", claiming that work "presupposes exact and realistic knowledge of material laws" as well as "legal order organically regulating men's life" (1971, 34). It is work, he insists, that relates social and natural orders: "It provides a basis for the subsequent development of a historical, dialectical conception of the world, which understands movement and change" (34). It follows from this conception that if generations have the opportunity to experience learning within which work supports autonomous thinking and discovery, then it may open the way to break the power of "career bureaucracy" and through this gap new qualities of ethics, morals and aesthetics may enter education.

In my opinion, the power of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics through education is not in its "imposed ideology" (Williams 1980, 39) or, as Eagleton puts it, in its "pleasurable conduct" (1990, 42). They consider the process of learning as a natural, non-authoriterised one of creation and behaviour according to the ethics and morals brought about by art and beauty of man's and nature's work. By this quality of the process people will have the chance to experience and practise creation and beauty in harmony with their physical and mental capacity. Man, the worker and the creator, may view the world and in it himself and his work differently when his main principles derive from those of beauty and nature. To learn to 'work with' his own thoughts and employ the rules of nature as well as experience what happiness this creation offers may enable man to open up and 'change'. It may also help him accept the ethics of work and labour based on aesthetics such as good, useful and gentle work, honesty, perfection and desire for quality. In Morris' view "book-students" are happy over work and they are" generally such pleasant people; so kind and even-tempered; so humble, and at the same time they are so anxious to teach everybody all that they know" (1890, 211). Considering the marked features (Gramsci 1971, 1988 and Williams 1980) of the relationship between education and hegemony and power I would sum up Morris' and Ruskin's theories of education initiated by aesthetics in the following points:

- hegemony of the state is supported by the power of institutionalised education

[338] These are schools where learning happens "though a spontaneous and anatomous" effort of the pupil. "And which would "take the child up to the threshold of his choice of job, forming him during this time as a person capable of thinking, studying and ruling" (1971, 32- 40).

and this power is secured by laws and money. In a more subtle way; power of education is represented with methods, doctrines, approaches initiated and applied by the state and the ruling classes by which they can manipulate the mind of other classes, mainly the subdued ones. But through gaps ethics and morals rooted in aesthetics the structure and the philosophy of education can be affected

- concepts of aesthetics related to ethics and education may lead to bringing up generations of 'creative thinkers' " whose prior considerations encompass a broad perspective, and are cast in terms of principles rather than rules [such a pesron], has a much better chance of discovering those alternatives which will lead eventually to his emancipation"[339].

Endorsing my previous perception, that Morris' and Ruskin's educative ethics relies upon the notion of change as a bearer of specific power I will discuss in some detail what meanings of change may exist in their philosophy.

8.1 Change: Quality of Change

As indicated in the Introduction I will approach the notion of **change** only from the aspect of Morris' and Ruskin's theory emphasising professional and personal change as a means of making life and environment more beautiful and bearable in the frightening shadow of money which dictates the taste, interest, values, ethics and morals. Out of many qualities, substances and forces of change I want to deal only with the question of quality. My reason for examining its meaning in Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics is simply to stress that whatever man does, produces or creates it will bear and express his thoughts, talent, mood, and attitude towards his own and others' work. If we are aware of the effect and importance of our work and to what extent we may contribute to change our environment, way of thinking and even sense of beauty the notion of quality is the first one which should be the major feature of our work and labour.

Morris and Ruskin see clearly that their nation's mentality, behaviour even language could be "bettered" if each member of the society were taught to appreciate *work of high quality.*. And, in Morris's and Ruskin's opinion, it is art and beauty that

[339] G. A. Kelly, *Theory Of Personality* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1963), 22.

can be our 'partners' in the process of learning to work and live 'beautifully'[340]. Ruskin is aware of the

> rate of changes which are, hour by hour is accelerating catastrophe, manifesting themselves in the laws, the arts, and the needs of men, it seems to me, that now at least, if never at any former time, the thoughts of the true nature of our life, and of its powers and responsibilities, should present themselves with absolute sadness and stresses (1898, 148).

He also remarks that "as we live we change and we should observe what is wrong and right"[341] and is convinced that "great change which we are working for, each in his own way, will come like other changes, as a thief in the night, and will be with us before we know it"[342]. Naturally change leaves its trace and it means that the man who has experienced change will never be the same person. Morris puts forward his doubts: which runs as follows "shall men be changed from what they are now?"[343]. It is evident for Morris and Ruskin that their age has 'expanded' both the content and the domain of human knowledge by the development of sciences and industry to such a degree that if a man was not going to be offered opportunities, for example, at schools, work-places etc. to be able to understand the changing world around him as well as to transfer new experience, thoughts and ideas by his knowledge into/by his work then he might not be condemned to 'slavery' throughout his all life. What really worries Ruskin and Morris, besides "the injustice, waste and evils of the society" (Hobson, 1898) is what quality of life working people will have if they were not exposed to new knowledge in work, if they are trained to do unhappy, unhealthy toil as a means of serving the wealth of others. What they think of quality of work is clearly set out by Morris, he writes,

> Quality [..] how could they possibly attend to such trifles as the quality of wares they sold? The best of them were of a lowish average, the worst were transparent make-shifts [..] which nobody would have put up with if they could have got anything else. [..] there was one class of goods they did make thoroughly well, and that was the class of machines [..] it may be fairly said

---

[340] I discussed the meanings of 'living beautifully' in the context of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics in chapter 7.

[341] Ruskin *Modern Painters* vol. 2. chp. 4. (1888, 35).

[342] Morris, *The Art of People*, in Ball ed. , (1931, :9).

[343] Morris, *A Dream of John Bull.*, in Ball ed. (1931:7).

that the great achievement of the nineteenth century was the making of machines which were wonders of invention, skill, and patience, and which were used for the production of measureless quantities of worthless make-shifts (1970, 209).

They are aware that lacking reflective-, critical thinking-, problem solving- and inquiry skills means that the worker will be deprived of further knowledge, therefore his life will be restricted to a narrow living-space lacking the chance of ever getting acquainted with creation. How could life like this receive beauty and art? This worker is not the one Morris and Ruskin would like to be brought up and educated in England; he would not be able to participate in a process which guides him towards understanding that he is and can be an active 'maker' of his own life and work. He will remain 'blind' and his distorted 'sense of beauty' and his relationships with his own and others' work will easily make him a target of manipulation of hegemony. Parallel with their educative ethics Morris and Ruskin wanted to offer means, approaches and techniques for people to be able to recognise these changes in and by their work, to adapt to them and develop the good sides of their humanity. Morris' and Ruskin's conceptions of change also support the premise of this study that it is their aesthetics inducing a process, the 'empowered aesthetics', which will ensure its effect at different levels of power. It must be pointed out that their theory could be implemented and introduced into practice and that therefore this theory in Kelly's opinion can be considered a "good one [which] provides an explicit framework within which certain deductions may be made and future events anticipated [..] the theory acts as a tool for the man who actively seeks to anticipate the future and to explore its possibilities" (1963:24). Morris clearly spelled out what changes should be brought about in relation to man's needs so that he could work as he is predestined to by his skills and abilities

1. a "healthy body" enabling him "to feel mere life a pleasure; to enjoy moving one's limbs [..] to play to be well formed, straight-lined, strongly knit, expressive of countenance- to be, in one word, beautiful"[344]
2. he should not be ill - housed, and "deprived of all the enjoyment of the natural beauty of the world" (124)
3. "to share of whatever knowledge there is in the world according to my (man's) capacity or bent of mind, historical or scientific; and also to have my

[344] Morris, *Signs of Change: How we live and how we might live*, in Ball ed. (1931, 123).

share of skill of hand which is about in the world, either in the industrial handicrafts or in the fine arts;" (124-125).

4. shaking off the slavery of profit and increasing "the amount of profit pouched by individuals for their own advantage.." (124)

5. he must be provided opportunity to "do some direct good to the community" with leisure "by practising arts or occupations for (my) hands or brain.." (126)

6. work-places should be pleasant

7. by the "new birth of art [..] people could not help showing their mirth and pleasure in their work, and would be always wishing to express" (128)

The notion of *quality* has already been raised several times in this study, for example in Chapter VII, mainly to show how *work and labour*, "the sense of the toil of manly hand and thought" (Ruskin 1849, 74) are conceived by and situated in Morris' and Ruskin's art. What Ruskin expresses in the following few words "'English hearts have more oak than stone in them [.]. but all that we do is small and mean, if not worse - thin, and wasted, and insubstantial" (Ruskin, 1849:101) would reflect a disillusioned man's opinion if we did not know that his sensibility and sense of beauty makes him urge people to change their mentality and start living, working, creating and building in a way worthy of thinkers, creators and human beings. What he says is,

> we are not to sent into this world to do anything into which we cannot put our hearts. We have certain work to do for our bread, and that is to be done strenuously; other work to do for our delight, and that is to be done heartily, neither is to be done by halves and shifts, but with a will (Ruskin 1849, 174).

The work of toilsome man and his "true delightness depends on our discovering in it the record of thoughts, and intents, and tricks, and heartbearings- of recoveries and joyfulness of success" (Ruskin 1849, 54).

In sum, in the context of Morris' and Ruskin's philosophy no single ethical and moral change can be thought of and realised unless man is educated to and helped become conscious of how to work beautifully and use his knowledge. Quality should be the focus of change regardless whether it is initiated by individuals, communities, or social groups. Practices which are clearly based on criteria and principles set by art and beauty are not tied to dominant class status. They involve everyone equally. What remains to be discussed and now are my concluding points and questions.

Chapter 9 Conclusion

In my dissertation I have organised my thoughts around two levels. One level of my reflections analyses discusses the roles, means and power of aesthetics, art and beauty of Morris and Ruskin in a civilisation in which money determined the lives of classes, groups and individuals affecting life and changing the environment[345] to such a degree that using beauty and art to modify man's attitudes towards *work and labour* and nature may seem hopeless and utopian even naive, especially if happiness, goodness and "blessedness" are attached to such notions as thinking, quality and creation. The other level deals with questions which examine the relationship between aesthetics and education, By these questions I have also wanted to indicate that our responsibilities in terms of work and labour in the light of aesthetics have not become less important than they were for Morris and Ruskin. My main point is to emphasise my agreement with Danto that in a society first the "sense of aesthetic taste" with the help of the "external senses" (Danto, 1981) should be developed by teaching so that people's "moral sense" can be affected. In order to test my thesis, first, I have established the theoretical background of the analysis. I have used concepts drawn from British Cultural Studies to support my arguments .and ways of seeing Morris' and Ruskin's views of art and beauty in a process which I have called "empowered aesthetics". By offering an overview of the development and different stages of the theories and examining how culturalism and structuralism, cultural materialism and new historicim relate to each other and have given way to postmodern, feminist, deconstructive and psychoanalytical theories. I have tried to situate my main questions around *art and beauty* by focusing on *work and labour*. From this it may be clear that these topics cannot be investigated without establishing the meanings of *civilisation and culture* in which *aesthetics* is embedded. I have touched upon issues such as classes, working classes and work and labour in Chapter III seemingly narrowing down the ideas of civilisation and culture to a few points, thus setting up markers for further analysis. In my view, I need these markers as the central question of Morris and Ruskin's

[345] Morris and Ruskin refused the practice of changing nature, towns and the quality and structure of life by machinery and exploiting nature's power e.g. steam. In Hobson's view the reasons for their hatred were: "the horror and brutalising toil of mining, the foul impurity of a smoke - laden atmosphere, the ugly structure and degrading monotony of factories and factory-towns, the devastation of beautiful localities by mines and mills.." *John Ruskin. Social Reform*er (London: James Nisbet, 1898), 211.

philosophy is the working classes and their work and labour as well as their relationship with the dominant classes. Against theories drawn from Cultural Studies in relation to these issues I investigated the content and meanings of work and labour initiated by Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics. As a way of exploring these two artists' views of art and beauty in Chapter IV out of many exciting questions I have highlighted the notions of *decorative, useful and popular art.* It is these questions which, in my opinion, synthesise their concepts of work and labour, their content, roles and functions through art and beauty. I have arrived at seeing their aesthetics as a process which raises ethics and education into its realm. They combine theory and practice into a single whole which can be a powerful means of revolt against physical and aesthetic 'poverty'. And, it is this leading me to discuss the questions of hegemony and power in Chapter V. I have attempted to understand how aesthetics relates to hegemony and whether it is right to think that there can exist some other aesthetics alongside the one whose major aim is to serve "dominant classes". Consequently I have arrived at viewing Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics as offering a theoretical and practical (educative) basis for the working classes/subdued classes, with values, ethics and morals so that their work and labour would serve their well-being and sense of beauty, and through this, the betterment of life, protection of nature and her beauties can be considered a potential alternative against *hegemonic aesthetics.* I am under no illusion as to the difficulty of relating humanism to the notion of power. But, in arguing for viewing Morris' and Ruskin's humanism within "Darwin's Nature" (Thorndike 1920, 225) as a key to understanding their aesthetics in relation to work and labour is in harmony with what I say in the Introduction. That is, the central question of Morris' and Ruskin' aesthetics is man: the thinker, the creator, the worker, the individual who has fears, worries and wants to understand what is happening around him and the world in which schoolboys know "more of the motion of the stars, the processes of growth and life in the animal world, and the application of electricity than did Shakespeare and Milton, [...] the general assurance is that, whatever we know today, we shall surely know a good deal more tomorrow" (Thorndike 1920, 229). In Chapter VI I have reflected upon the qualities and meanings of work and labour in Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics which might contribute to viewing their concepts as one way of 'empowering' aesthetics. I am aware of the limits of the analysis and here I have consciously chosen only few points to examine, for example, "*work of nature*", the necessity of "spots of blackness" in relation to man's work, values and quality,

mechanical vs. intelligent work, *architecture* as "the manifestation of human intelligence" But, I think that by these points I have managed to reveal the aesthetic alternatives of work and labour by moral and ethical change. This was the phase of my study when I thought I could come nearer the roots of Morris' and Ruskin's 'empowered aesthetics". Therefore, my concern in Chapters VI and VII was to indicate the ethical and moral qualities of Morris' and Ruskin's aesthetics reinforced by their educative principles. In the rest of my inquiry I have looked at the substance and forms of *change* within Morris' and Ruskin aesthetics. The question of my investigation s narrowed down to the notion of change in terms of work and labour.

9.1 Reality: Aesthetics? Labour and Work?

The question marks of the title indicate that the question raised in the nineteenth century by Morris and Ruskin is still waiting to be answered. It has become by now a commonplace that what we produce should reflect some quality to make people buy more and more things and in this respect aesthetics is subordinated to the interest of translating work into producing more money. *Aesthetics* expressed in the final production of *work and labour* is taken into consideration only if it is not accompanied with loss of money. Classes having enough money, and by this gaining power to dictate the taste, the principles of ethics and aesthetics of other classes no longer meditate on how art and beauty could bring about happiness and goodness in/by work and labour. And, these are the qualities of life which Morris and Ruskin wanted people to fight against. Lyotard [346] characterises capitalism, our world, by the following words which, in his view, have been borrowed from political economy and historical periodisation, transmit, order, reproduce, conserve, combine and conclude (calculations) and information. He remarks that this phenomenon also reflects the fact that capitalism starts penetrating into language too. Although both Morris and Ruskin realise that the rate of industrial and social changes cannot be stopped and aesthetics and the Arts and Crafts movement by themselves will not upset the society so that "artificial famine"[347] and social injustices will not disappear. It is a fact that the impact of their arts on the European and American culture is still significant. It is present in

[346] Jean-Francois Lyotard, "Rules and Paradoxis and Svelte Appendix", trans. Briam Massumi, *Culturall Critiques*, 5(1986-7), 209-19.

the art and Aestheticism of the "After the Pre-Raphaelites'[348] British artists, for example, James McNeil Whistler, Jacob-Hood and Sickert. and in the tradition, forms and colours of Art Nuoveau; the Modern Style[349] whose path-breaker was Morris. Frank Lloyd Wright's works in Chicago, Otto Wagner's buildings in Vienna, Hector Guimards' pieces of furniture were born in the spirit of the Modern Style. People use this furniture, live in these buildings whose decorations, forms, colours and structures may affect their taste and sense of beauty. Seemingly, these useful things and constructions are far from Morris' and Ruskin's philosophy especially when we look at it as the main means of revolt[350]. But, if we consider it the outcome of perfect, harmonious work of high quality, and if education is attached to the meanings of revolt[351] in the twenty first century then viewing Morris' and Ruskin's philosophy as non-utopian in general may seems an acceptable argument. Naturally my purpose has not been to force out one or more 'clean-cut' answers to prove my thesis. To show this I will finish my study with questions raised by James Redmond?[352] which are, in my opinion, still valid:

- How can we create the society we would like to live in?
- Is efficient mass-production really what we value more than anything?
- Do we spend our lives working to satisfy real needs and desires?
- Do we sacrifice ourselves to maintain a social system where human wants are subordinated to do demand for ever-increasing commerce?
- Do we ask ourselves often enough what we really want from life

---

[347] Morris (1872, 94).

[348] The series of articles in Elizabeth Prettejohns's ed (1999) details this period of British art.

[349] I have also consulted Klaus-Jürgen Sembach *Szecesszió* (Budapest: Taschen, 1999) for details.

[350] By the meaning of revolt I mean the notion of "empowered aesthetics" discussed in this study.

[351] In my view education could be a potential means against modern "aesthetic bareness" if art and beauty were not marginalised subjects at schools.

[352] William Morris Jemas Redmon, ed Foreword *News From Nowhere or an epoch of rest* (1970,) 18.

REFERENCES

Abrams, H.V. *The Mirror and the Lamp. Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953

Adams, Steven. *The Art Of The Pre-Raphaelites.* London: New Burlington Books, 1988

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses". In *Lenin and Philosophy. and Other Essays.* Trans. by , Ben Brewster. London: New Left Books London: New Left Books, 1971, 121-173.

Altick, D.R. *Victorian People.* London: J.M. Dent, 1974

Arnold, Matthew. *Culture And Anarchy.* Samuel Lipman ed. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1869

— *Democratic Education.* R.H. Super ed. The University of Michigan, 1962.

— *Dissent And Dogma.* R.H. Super ed., The University of Michigan, 1968

— *God And The Bible.* R.H. Super ed., Michigan: Longmans, 1970

Aschcroft, T. *English Art And Society.* London: Peter Davis, 1936

Baldick, Chris. *The Social Mission of English Criticism 1848-1932.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983

Ball, A.H.R. ed. *Ruskin as Literary Critic.* New York: Greenwood Press, 1928.

Ball, A.H.R. ed. *Selections From The Prose Works Of William Morris.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1931

Ball, Patricia M. *The Science of Aspects.The Changing Role of Fact in the Work of Coleridge, Ruskin and Hopkins.* University of London: The Athlone Press,1971 York: Methuen, 1986

Barnes, Rachel. *The Pre-Raphaelites and their World.* London: The Tate Gallery Publishing, 1998

Beach, Joseph Warren. *The Concept of Nature in Nineteenth-Century English Poetry.* New York: Russell and Russell, 1966

Bell, Quentin. *Victorian Artists.* London: Routledge And Kegan Paul, 1967

Bennett, Tony. "Putting policy into cultural studies" In John Storey ed. *What is Cultural Studies? A Reader.* London: Arnold, 1966, 307-321.

— *Formalism And Marxism.* London and New York: Methuen, 1979

— "The politics of 'the popular' and popular culture". In Bennett et al.. eds. *Popular*

Culture and Social Relations. A Reader. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1986, 6-20.

— "Introduction: popular culture and 'the turn to Gramsci'. In Bennett et al.. eds. *Popular Culture and Social Relations. A Reader. Philadelphia:* Open University Press, 1986, xi-xviii.

Bennett, Tony et al. *Culture, Ideology And Social Process.* London: The Open University Press, 1981

Bennett, Tony et al. eds. *Popular Culture and Social Relations. A Reader.Philadelphia:* Open University Press, 1986

Bentham, Jeremy. *An Introduction To The Principles Of Morals And Legislation.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1783

Bentham, Jeremy. *Panopticum.* In Michel Foucault. *Power. Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977.* Colin Gordon ed. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980

Bloom, Harold. *The Literary Criticism of John Ruskin.* New York: Anchor Books, 1965

Bourdieu, Pierre. *What Makes a Social Class? On The Theoretical and Practical Existence Of Groups. Berkeley Journal of Sociology* (1987,) 1-17.

Briggs, Asa ed: *William Morris: Selected Writings and Designs.* London Harmondsworth Penguin Books, 1962

Buckley, Jerome Hamilton. *The Victorian Temper.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1951

Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful.* Adam Philips ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. First published in 1757

Burstin, Joan N: *Victorian Education And The Ideal Of Womanhood.* London: Croom Helm, 1980

Cameron, Kenneth Neil ed. *Percy Bysshe Shelley. Selected Poetry and Preos.* London: Rinehart 1951

Carlyle, Thomas. *Past And Present.* Richard D. Altick ed. New York: University Press, 1843

Carritt, E.F. *The Theory Of Beauty*. London: Metguen, 1914

Clark, J.C.D. *English Society 1688-1832*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985

Clarke, John et al.. "Sub Cultures,Culture and Class." In Bennett et al. eds. *Culture, Ideology and Social Process. A Reader*. London: The Open University Press, 1981, 53-79.

Danto, Arthur C. *Analytical Philosophy Of Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973

— *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace. A Philosophy of Art*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1981

de Man, Paul. *Blindness and Insight*. 2nd rev. edn. London: Methuen, 1983

— *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984

Derek, Fraser. *The Evolution Of The British Welfare State*. London: MacMillan, 1973

Dollimore, Jonathan and Alan Sinfield eds. *Political Shakespeare. New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985

Donajgrodzki, A.P. ed.. *Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britain*. London: Croom Helm, 1977

Ducasse, Curt John. *The Philosophy Of Art*. New York: Dover Publications, 1966

Eagleton, Terry "Aesthetics and Politics" *New Left Review*, no. 107 (January/February 1975), 21-34.

— *Literary Theory*. Oxford: Oxford Basil Blackwell, 1983

— *Against The Grain*. Selected Essays. London and New York: Verso, 1986

— *British Post-Structuralism Since 1968*. London and New York: Routledge, 1988

— *The Ideology Of The Aesthetic*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990

Easthope, Anthony. *British Post-Structuralism Since 1968*. London and New York: Routledge, 1988

Engels, Friedrich. *Letter to Laura Lafargue*. In Paul and Laura Lafargue. *Correspondence*. Lawrence and Wishart, 1950

Evans, Joan ed. *The Lamp Of Beauty. Writings on Art by John Ruskin*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1959

Fiske, John. *Power Plays. Power Works*. London, New York:Verso, 1993

— "British Cultural Studies on Television." In J. Storey ed. *What Is Cultural Studies? A Reader.* London: Arnold, 1996, 111-125.

Forgacs, David. ed. *An Antonio Gramsci Reader. Selected Writings 1916-1935.* New York: Schoken Books, 1988

Foucault, Michel. *Power. Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977.* Colin Gordon ed. Trans. by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980

Frith, Simon. "The Good, the Bad, and the Indifference: defending Popular Culturefrom the Populist." *Diacritics*, 21:4 (1991): 102-125.

Frow, John. *Cultural Studies and Cultural Value.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995

Gans, Herbert J. *Popular Culture And High Culture. An Analysis and Evaluation of Taste.* New York: Basic Books, 1974

Garrod, H.W- ed. *Keats Political Works.* London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation Of Cultures.* London: Fontana, 1973

George, Henry. *Progress And Poverty.* London: The Henry George Foundation of Great Britain, 1939

Gewirth, Alan. *Reason And Morality.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978

Gill, Stephen ed. *The Oxford Authors. William Wordsworth* Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1984

Glasier, J. Bruce. *William Morris And The Early Days Of The Socialist Movement.* 2nd. ed. London: Longmans, 1921

Goetz, Mary Dorothea. *A Study Of Ruskin's Concept Of The Imagination.* Washington. D.C.: The Catholic University Of America, 1947

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections From The Prison Notebooks.* Quintin Hoare and Geffrey Nowell Smith eds. , London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971

—"On Education." Quibitin Hoare and Geffrey N. Smith eds. London: Lawrence and Wishart London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971, 26-43.

—*Selections From The Prison Notebooks.* In Tony Bennett et al.. *Culture, Ideology And Social Process.* London: The Open University Press, 1981

—"Observations on the School: In Search of the Educational Principle." In David. Forgacs, ed. An Antonio Gramsci *Reader. Selected Writings 1916-*

1935. New York: Schoken Books, 1988, 311-320.

Gray, Robert. "Bourgeois Hegemony in Victorian Britain" In Bennett et al. eds. *Culture, Ideology and Social Process* London. The Open University Press 1981

Greenblatt, Steephen. "Towards a Cultural Poetics". In H. Aram Veeser ed. *The New Historicism.* New York: Routledge, 1989, 1-14.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural studies: two paradigms." In John Storey ed. *What is Cultural Studies? A Reader.* London: Arnold, 1966, 31-49.

—"Notes on Deconstructing " the Popular", in Raphael Samuel ed., *People's History and Socialist Theory.* London: Routledge, 1981, 227-41.

—"Popular culture and the state." In Bennett et al.1 *: Popular Culture and Social Relations* Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1986, 22-68.

Hall, Stuart et al. "Marxism and culture". *Screen,* 18. no.4 (1977 Winter): 109-119.

Hart, Jennifer. "Religion and Social Control in the mid-Nineteenth Century." In A.P. Donajgrodzki ed. *Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britain.* London: Croom Helm, 1977, 118-137.

Hay, D.R., F.R.S.E. *The Science of Beauty, As Developed In Nature And Applied In Art.* London and Edinburgh: Willaim Blackwood, 1856

Hipple, Walter John Jr. *The Beautiful, The Sublime, and The Picturesque In Eighteenth-Century. British Aesthetic Theory.* The Southern Illinois University Press: Cabondale, 1957

Hobson, J. A. *John Ruskin Social Reformer.* London: James Nisbet, 1898

Hoggart, Richard. *The Uses Of Literacy.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1957

— *Contemporary Cultural Studies. An Approach to the Study of Literature and Society.* Occasional Paper No.6. Birmingham University of Birmingham, 1969

Hollis, Patricia. *Class and Conflict in Nineteenth-Century England 1815-1850.* London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973

Hough, Graham. *The Last Romantics.* London: Methuen, 1974

Houghton, Walter E. *The Victorian Frame Of Mind, 1830-1870.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957

Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding And A Treatise Of Human Nature.* London: Penguin, 1739

Hunt, Alan ed. *Class And Class Structure.* London: Lawrence And Wishart, 1977

— "Theory And Politics In The Identification Of The Working Class". In Hunt ed. *Class And Class Structure.* London: Lawrence And Wishart, 1977, 81-107.

Hutcheson, Francis. *An Inquiry Concerning Beauty, Order, Harmony, Design.* Peter Kivy ed. The Hague: Martinus Nuhoff, 1973

Huxley, Thomas H. *Science And Education.* Vol. III London: Macmillan, 1893

Ingles, Fred. *Cultural Studies.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1993

Johnson, Richard. "Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britain". In A. P. Donajgrodzki ed. *Educating The Educators: Experts And The State 1833-9* London: Croom Helm, 1977

— ""Educating The Educators: Experts And The State 1833-9". In A. P. Donajgrodzki ed. *Educating The Educators: Experts And The State 1833-9* London: Croom Helm, 1977, 69-81.

— "What is cultural studies anyway?" In John Storex ed. *What is Cultural Studies? A Reader.* London: Arnold, 1966, 75-111.

Kelly, G.A. A: *Theory of Personality.* New York: W.W. Norton, 1963

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Renaissance Thought II Papers on Humanism and the Arts* New York:,Evanston, and London: Harper Torcjbooks, 1965

Ladd, Henry. *The Victorian Morality of Art. An Analysis of Ruskin Esthetic.* New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, 1932

Lafrague. Paul and Laura .*Correspondence.* Lawrence and Wishart, 1950

Landow, George P: *J.D. Harding and John Ruskin. Nature's infinite variety. JAAC* X xvii, (1970) 369-380

— *The Aesthetic And Critical Theories Of John Ruskin.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971

Lewis, Peter ed. *William Morris: Aspects of The Man and his Work* Loughborough: Victorian Studies Group, 1977

Lovell, Terry: *Pictures Of Reality Aesthetics, Politics, Pleasure.* Lonndon: British Film Institute, 1980

Lyotard Jean-Francois. "Rules and Paradoxis and Svelte Appendix", trans. Briam

Massumi, *Cuétural Critiques,* 5 (1986-7), 209-19.

Makaryk, Irena R *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, .1993

Mackenzie, Norman ed. *Conviction*: London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1958

Mayhew, Henry. *London Labour And The London Poor.* London: Penguin, 1972

Mill, James. *Utilitarian Logic and Politics. Essay On Government. Macaulay's Critique and the Ensuing Debate.* Jack Lively ed.. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978

—"Greatest Happiness Principle" *Westminster Review,* Vol . 21. July (1829) 140. In James Mill, *Utilitarian Logic and Politics. Essay On Government.* Macaulay's Critique and the Ensuing Debate. Jack Lively ed.. Oxford: Clarendon Press, V 1978.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty.* London: Penguin Books, 1859

Morley, John Viscount. *Recollections.* Toronto: The Macmillan, 1915

Morley, John Viscount. *On Compromise.* Toronto: Macmillen, 1933

Morris, William. *Signs Of Change. Lectures On Socialism.* Vol. XXIII. London: Longmans Green, 1970. First published 1890

—*News From Nowhere* James Redmond ed. London and New York: Routledge, 1970. First published in 1890.

—*Political Writings. Contributions to Justice and Commonweal 1883-1890.* Nicholas Salamon ed Bristol: Theommes Press, 1994.

Munro, Thomas. *The Arts and Their Interrelations.* New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1949

Murray, John. *Artists On Art .From The 14th To The 20th Century.* London: Fletcher, 1976

Nairn, Tom. "The English Working Class"*: New Left Review,* nov. 24 (March/April), 1964, 43-57.

Nozick, Robert. *Anarchy, State, And Utopia.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1974

Paulanzus, Nicolas et al.. eds. *After the Pre-Phaelites. Art and Aestheticim in Victorian England* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999

Pope, Rob. *The English Studies Book.* London: Routledge, 1998

Poulatzas, Nicos. *Classes in Contemporary Capitallism,* Trans. David Fenbach London: Verso, 1975

Prettejohm, Elisabeth. *After the Pre-Raphaelites. Art and Aetheticim in Victorian England*- Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.

Richards, I.A. ed. *The Portable Coleridge*. New York: The Viking Press, 1950

Roe, Frederick William. *The Social Philosophy of Carlyle and Ruskin*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1921

Rosenberg, John D. *The Darkening Glass A Portrait Of Ruskin's Genius*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963

Routh, H. V. *Towards The Twentieth Century. Essays In The Spiritual History Of The Nineteenth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937

— *Money, Morals and Manners as Revealed In Modern Literature*. London: George Allen amd Unwin, 1935

Rowse, Tim. "The Trouble with Hegemony: Popular Culture and Multiculturalism." *Politics* (Nov. 1985) 70- 76.

Ruskin, John. *The Seven Lamps Of Architecture*. London: George Allen, 1849

— *On The Old Road*. London: George Allen, 1885

— *The Stones of Venice*. Vol 1-4. London: George Allen, 1886

— *Modern Painters*. Vol. I. Parts I., II.. Kent: George Allen, 1888

— *Modern Painters*. Vol. II. Part III. Kent: George Allen, 1888

— *Modern Painters*. Vol. IV. Part V. Kent: George Allen, 1888

— *Sesame And Lilies. Three Lectures*. London: George Allen, 1893

— *The Ethics of The Dust*. London: George Allen, 1896, first published 1865

— *The Crown of Wild Olive. Four Lectures on Industry and War*. London: George Allen, 1898

— *Unto This Last and Munere Pulveris*. Leipzig: Bernhard Touchnitz,, 1906

— *The Political Economy Of Art*. London: Routledge, 1907

Samuel, Raphael. ed. *People's History And Socialist Theory*. London, Boston and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981

Sembach, Klaus-Jürgen. *Szecesszió*. Budapest, Taschen, 1999

Shelley, P.B. "A Defence of Poetry" in Kenneth Neil Cameron ed. *Percy Bysshe Shelley. Selected Poetry and Prose* . London: Rinehart, 1951

Shiach, Morag. *Discourse On Popular Culture*. California: Stanford University Press, 1989

Schiller, Friedrich. Wilkinson, Elisabeth M and L.A. Willoughby eds. *On the*

Aesthetic Education of Man In a Series of Letters Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967

Scott, Geoffrey. *The Architecture Of Humanism. A Study in the History of Taste.* Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1914

Schwartz, Bill. "Where Is Cultural Studies ?," *Cultural Studies* 8 (3) (1994): 377-393.

Sinfield, Alan. *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989

Szőnyi, György Endre.. "Az 'újhistoricizmus' és a mai amerikai Shakespeare-kutatás". *Helikon* 44. 1-2 (1998): 11-33.

Sprinker, Michel. *Imaginary Relations. Aesthetics and Ideology in the Theory of Historical Materialism.* London: Verso, 1987

Stein, Richard L. *The Ritual Of Interpretation. The Time, Arts As Literature. Ruskin, Rossetti,* And Pater. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard University Press, 1975

Storey, John ed. *What Is Cultural Studies? A Reader.* London, New York, Sydney:Arnold, 1996

Thomson, David. *England in the Nineteenth Century (1815-1944).* Harmondsworth-Middlesex: Penguin Bokks, 1952

Thompson, E.P. *The Poverty Of Theory and Other Essays.* London: Merlyn Press, 1978

Thompson, E. P. *William Morris. Romantic to Revolutionary.* London: Merlin Press, 1955

— *The Making of The English Working Class.* New York and London: Penguin Books, 1963

Thompson, John O. *"Popular culture: the pleasure and the pain". Screen Education* 41 (Winter/Spring 1982): 43-52.

Thorndike, Ashley H. *Literature In A Changing Age.* New York: Books For Libraries Press, 1920

Turner, Graeme. *British Cultural Studies. An Intorduction.* London, New York:Routledge, 1990

Wayne, Don, E. "Power, politics and the Shakespearean text." In Howard, Jean E. and Marion F. O'Connor eds. *Shakespeare Reproduced. The Text In History and Ideology.* New York, London: Routledge,: 1987

Wiener, Martin J. *English Culture And The Decline Of The Industrial Spirit*

1'850-1980. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981

Willis, Paul. *Learning To Labour. Cambridge*. Cambridge University Press, 1978

— "Class and institutional form of counter-school culture." In Bennett and et al. eds. *Culture, Ideology and Social Process*. 1981, 81-108.

Williams, Bernard. *Ethics And The Limits Of Philosophy*. Frank Kermode ed. London: Fontana Masterguides, 1985

— *'Morality' An Introduction to Ethics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture And Society. Coleridge to Orwell*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1958

— "Culture is Ordinary". In Norman Mackenzie ed. *Conviction*. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1958, 74-92.

— *The Long Revolution*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966

— *Keywords A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London::Flamingo, 1976

— *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977

—*Problems in Materialism and Culture*. London: Verso, 1980

— "The Analysis of Culture." In Bennett et al. eds. *Culture, Ideology and Social Process*. London: The Open University Press, 1981, 43-52.

Williamson, Bill "Learning the Language of the Job. Jobs and Identity in Twentieth Century Britain." *Journal For The Study Of British Culture s Vol. 7 – No. 2/00 (2000):95-111*

Wood, Christopher. *The Pre-Raphaelites*. New York: The Viking Press, 1981

Wordsworth, William. "Preface To Lyrical Ballads". In Stephen Gill ed. *The Oxford Authors. William Wordsworth*. Oxford,: New York: Oxford University Press, 1984

Yeo, Eileen and Stephen eds. *Popular Culture and Class Conflict 1580-1914:Explorations in the History of Labour and Leisure* Sussex, The Harvester Press, 1981

Yeo, Eileen. "Culture and Constraint in Working Class Movements, *1830-1855*." In. Eileen. and Stephen. Yeo eds. *Popular Culture and Class Conflict 1580-1914:Explorations in the History of Labour and Leisure*. .Sussex:: The Harvester Press, 1981, 155-187.

Yeo, Stephen "Ways of Seeing: Control and Leisure versus Class and Struggle." In " Eileen and Yeo Stephen eds. *Popular Culture and Class Conflict*

1580-1914:Explorations in the History of Labour and Leisure. Sussex:: The Harvester Press, 1981, 128-155.

Young, G.M. *Portrait Of An Age. Victorian England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960

Zweig, Ferdinand. *Labour, Life And Poverty.* London: Victor Gollancz, 1949

— *Women's Life And Labour.* London: Victor Gollancz, 1952

— *The British Worker.* Harmondsworth-Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1952.